Keith Whinnom, 1927—; educated King Edward VI Grammar School, Morpeth and The Queen's College, Oxford, where he obtained a First Class degree in Modern Languages; Laming Travelling Fellow of The Queen's College (Madrid); Lecturer in Romance Languages (Hong Kong); Lecturer in Spanish, Trinity College, Dublin.

Spanish Contact Vernaculars deals with three of the four vernaculars still extant in the Philippine Islands. It is the first synthesis of the information available about these dialects, which have not so far been dealt with comparatively, offers an entirely new explanation of their origin, reprints inaccessible texts of two of the dialects and prints new texts of the third, gives a detailed analysis of their grammar and sound-systems, and contains phonetic transcriptions of the speech of three modern speakers of these languages.

HK$22.50
Abroad from the
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
Amen House, E.C.4, and New York
Price (in U.K. only) 30s net
in U.S.A., US$5.00

SPANISH CONTACT VERNACULARS IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

SPANISH IN THE PHILIPPINES
A Sociolinguistic Survey
Journal of Oriental Studies, I, i, 1954, Hong Kong

Spanish Contact Vernaculars in the Philippine Islands

Keith Whinnom, M.A.
Lecturer in Romance Languages
in the University of Hong Kong

HONG KONG UNIVERSITY PRESS
London: Geoffrey Cumberlege
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
1956

Printed in September 1956, 750 copies

THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS, AMEN HOUSE, LONDON, E.C.4.
ARE THE EXCLUSIVE AGENTS FOR ALL COUNTRIES EXCEPT
AMERICA AND ASIA EAST OF BURMA

香 港 印
Printed in Hong Kong by
CATHAY PRESS
153 Island Road at Aberdeen

CONTENTS

PREFACE

THIS book deals with three of the four Spanish contact vernaculars still extant in the Philippine Islands. Bloomfield referred to them as extinct in 1933[1] and they are, it is to be feared, rapidly dying out. It is always a hazardous business prophesying the extinction of any language—all kinds of unreckoned loyalties come into play in keeping a language alive—but with the language-situation as it is in the Philippines, it seems a fair assumption that in another generation there will not be a native speaker of these languages left. As it is it has been difficult to find samples and speakers of two of these dialects, and the third is rapidly disintegrating.

Work has been done on individual members of this group of dialects before[2] and some texts of Chavacano have been published since I began this study.[3] But what has been written is largely inaccessible to anyone outside the Philippines, and I know of no work which treats them all together, deals with their affiliation, or supplies material for an analysis of their sound-systems.

I have collected here all the available information about the origin of these languages and offer an explanation of their genesis which, so far as I know, has not occurred to anyone before. I reprint inaccessible texts of two of these dialects and print for the first time texts of the third which are a salutary correction to the texts supplied by McKaughan.[4] And I give phonetic transcriptions of the speech of three modern speakers of these dialects. It is possible that in another ten years this could not have been done.

Contact vernaculars in general, in fact, are vanishing from the modern world. It is possible that none are yet totally extinct, for though I have seen it asserted that, among others, Chinook and the Philippine vernaculars are no longer spoken, I have evidence to the contrary in both instances. They are, however—this much is undeniable—on the verge of extinction. Pidgin, Indo-Portuguese, and Beach-la-Mar are fading fast, and only the creolized Krio of Sierra Leone shows any real vigour. Contact vernaculars, in the sense in which I use the term, and in which

[1] Leonard Bloomfield, *Language*, New York, 1933, revised edition, London, 1935, p. 472: 'a Spanish jargon was formerly spoken in the Philippines'.

[2] References will be found in the Bibliographical Notes which precede the sections dealing with Ermitaño, Caviteño, and Zamboangueño.

[3] Howard P. McKaughan, 'Notes on Chabacano Grammar', *Journal of East Asiatic Studies* (University of Manila), III, 2 (January 1954), pp. 205–243.

[4] McKaughan's speaker was the daughter of a family isolated from contact with Chavacano for a generation. The homogeneous dialect he records is not to be heard in Zamboanga today.

it is customarily employed,[5] are the products of European expansion in Asia, Africa, and America in the last four hundred years, and, marginal languages, they are disappearing as their marginal cultures disappear.[6]

This book, however, is not a sociolinguistic or anthropological study;[7] nor will the reader find here much general comment on languages in contact.[8] It is simply a description and analysis of three creolized contact vernaculars which will not much longer be available for study.

KEITH WHINNOM

University of Hong Kong
May 1955

[5] Linguistically there is no reason why a contact vernacular should be uniquely the product of a European language and an aboriginal tongue, and, although it is generally accepted that all contact vernaculars do happen to conform to this formula, I have information concerning a language spoken on the north-western frontier of Indo-China which seems to be a Chinese contact vernacular.

[6] The whole problem of marginal languages and marginal cultures was first discussed by Richard Loewe, 'Zur Sprach- und Mundartenmischung', *Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie und Sprachwissenschaft*, X (1890), pp. 261–305. Though strictly the domain of sociolinguistics the cultural background of the contact vernaculars has been handled mainly by anthropologists studying acculturation.

[7] I hope to publish elsewhere some comments on the linguistic concomitants of acculturation, as well as a separate study of Pidgin English.

[8] Uriel Weinreich, *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*, New York: Publications of the Linguistic Circle of New York No. 1, 1953, has dealt with this subject at some length and in impressive detail. There will be little to add to his work for some time to come.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I AM so deeply indebted to so many people in the Philippines for their unfailing kindness and ready assistance during my stay there that it would be impossible to mention them all.

I must, however, record my special debt to Dr H. Otley Beyer, Emeritus Professor of Anthropology in the University of the Philippines, now Director of the Museum of Archæology and Ethnology in Manila, who allowed me to read the thesis on Caviteño by Antonio Santos y Gómez which forms part of his collection of Tagalog papers; to Professor Jaime C. de Veyra, Director of the Bureau of Public Libraries, who procured for me the Ermitaño text which I here reprint; to Dr Henry A. Singer, who placed the Mutual Security Agency's tape-recorder at my disposal; to Mr Manuel P. Vaca and Mrs Estela Faust, who recorded samples of Caviteño and Ermitaño respectively, and to Mr Hipólito Valera and Mr Ben Bolante who recorded the sample of Zamboangueño; and to Mr Felipe Saavedra Jr, of Zamboanga, who wrote down folk-songs for me. I am also deeply grateful for the assistance given me by the United Nations Organization in Manila, and the many personal kindnesses shown me by its staff, in particular Mr Jan Smid, Head of the UNESCO Office, Dr W. J. Ellis, Resident Technical Assistance Officer, Mrs Michael Starkey, and Mrs Charles Rice. Finally I must record my debt to Dr Cecilio López, Professor of Oriental Languages in the University of the Philippines, and Acting Director of the National Language Institute, who read and criticized the manuscript and made many helpful suggestions.

I am indebted to my colleagues in the University of Hong Kong, to Mr A. W. T. Green for checking my phonetic transcriptions against the recordings of the vernaculars, to Mr Frank H. H. King for assistance in preparing the manuscript for the press, and to my wife for drawing the maps. I must mention also the grant-in-aid from the University, without which I could not have undertaken these researches.

LIST OF PHONETIC SYMBOLS EMPLOYED

WITH only very slight modifications, all the symbols employed in this book are those of the International Phonetic Alphabet, familiar to a majority of linguists. Following a well-established convention, all these symbols are enclosed in brackets wherever they occur in the text. Their values are as follows:

[p], [t], [k], [b], [d], [m], [n], [l], [f], and [h] have their common European values.

[g] is the voiced velar occlusive, as in English *go*.

[j] is the palatal semi-consonant, as English *y* in *yet*.

[r] is used here to denote the Spanish and Tagalog single-trill or flapped *r*, as in Spanish *pero*.

[rr] is here used for the multiple-trill or rolled *r*, as in Spanish *rosa*, *perro*.

[ɹ] is the relaxed fricative *r*, as in English *dry*, and, usually, Spanish *hablar*.

[s] is the dorso-alveolar *s*, common to English, French, Tagalog, and South American Spanish.

[ś] is the Spanish cacuminal *s*, used in Castille.

[ṡ] is the coronal *s*, used in parts of Andalusia.

[v] is the voiced labio-dental fricative, as in English, French, Italian.

[w] is the velar semi-consonant, as in English *way*, as *u* in Spanish *cuadro*.

[z] is the voiced sibilant, as in English and French.

[ʔ] is the glottal stop, sometimes heard as a substitute for *t* in vulgar English *wa'er*, *be'er* (for 'water' and 'better'), and employed in Tagalog.

[ɱ] is the labio-dental nasal, as in Spanish *anfiteatro*.

[ɲ] is the palatal sound of *ñ* in Spanish *señor*, *montaña*, of *gn* in French *seigneur*, Italian *montagna*.

[ŋ] is the velar nasal, Spanish *n* in *banco*, English *ng* in *sing*, Tagalog *ng* in all positions.

[ɫ] is the 'dark' *l* of English *well*, *fall*.

[ʎ] is the palatal sound of *ll* in Spanish *villa*, Italian *gl* in *egli*.

[ɸ] is the voiceless bilabial fricative, not employed in European languages, but sometimes heard in the Spanish of Chile.

[β] is the voiced bilabial fricative, as in Spanish *caballo*.

[θ] is the voiceless interdental fricative, as in English *thin*, Castilian Spanish *c* in *hacer*, *z* in *azul*.

[ð] is the voiced interdental fricative, as in English *then*, Spanish *d* in *comprado*, *ciudad*.

[ʃ] is the palatal sibilant, as *sh* in English *ship*.

[tʃ] is the voiceless affricate, *ch* in English *church*, Spanish *muchacho*.

[ʒ] is the voiced palatal sibilant, as English *s* in *pleasure*, French *j* in *jour*, or *ll* in South American Spanish.

[dʒ] is the voiced affricate, as English *j* and *g* in *judge*, Spanish *y* in *yo*, *ya*.

[ʂ] is the retroflexive *s* heard in Mandarin before an *i*, *hs* in the Wade system of transcription.

[ɣ] is a voiced velar fricative, as *g* in Spanish *hago*.

[x] is the voiceless velar spirant, as *j* in Spanish *jota*, *g* in *general*.

[i] as in French, Spanish, Italian *si*.

[e] as in French *été*, Spanish *de*.

[ɛ] as in English *better*, French *mettre*.

[a] as in Northern English *bad*, French *patte*.

[ɑ] as in English *father*, French *pâle*.

[ɔ] as in French *porte*.

[o] as in French *beau*.

[u] as in French *tout*, Spanish *tú*.

[ə] is the 'neutral' vowel, as in French *petit*, English *about*.

< signifies 'is derived from'.

> signifies 'becomes'.

* indicates a hypothetical form, or, in the running phonetic transcriptions, a proper name.

⁀ indicates diphthongization taking place between the final vowel of one word and the initial vowel of the following word.

~ indicates nasalization of the vowel under it.

ˈ indicates that the following syllable is tonic.

˘ indicates the weaker element of a diphthong.

Superscript consonants are weakly pronounced, or, if they are final occlusives, they are implosive.

MANILA
CAVITE CITY
KAWIT
TANZA
TERNATE

LUZON
NORTH PACIFIC
MANILA
CAVITE
SOUTH CHINA SEA
SULU SEA
ZAMBOANGA
MINDANAO
DAVAO
BRITISH NORTH BORNEO
CELEBES SEA
TERNATE
HALMAHERA
CELEBES

RIZAL PROVINCE
QUEZON CITY
TONDO
STA CRUZ
NORTH
HARBOUR
SAMPALOC
BINONDO
QUIAPO
S. NICOLAS
MALACAÑANG
INTRA-
MUROS
CAMPO DE
BAGONG
BAYAN
ERMITA
STA ANA
SOUTH
HARBOUR
MALATE
PASAY CITY
CITY OF
MANILA

CHAPTER I

HISTORY OF THE PHILIPPINE CONTACT VERNACULARS

Introduction—The Double Contact—Classes of Immigrants—The First Contact: Ternate—Portuguese Pidgin and Ternateño—Manila—Caviteño—Ermitaño—Zamboangueño—Davaueño—Affiliation.

The history of Pidgin and its congeners means something rather different from the history of, say, English or Chinese. The linguistic history of any contact vernacular is bound to be almost entirely undocumented, and the principal problem is not their development but their genesis; for, differing in this from what we usually understand by 'languages', they have all a definite beginning at some point, or during some limited period, in historical time.

The genesis of no contact vernacular has ever, so far, been attended by a competent observer, and accounts of the origin of these languages are as likely to be the products of a fertile imagination as the conclusions of a scrupulously scientific mind working from facts. We are fortunate, however, in that the genesis of the Philippine contact vernaculars demands a good deal less of an imaginative effort than that of, for instance, Chinook or Beach-la-Mar, for they are, to borrow Kroeber's term, examples of invention by stimulus diffusion,[1] rather than independent growths. They are, in short, imitations of another kind of pidgin.

But before we track the Philippine vernaculars back to their source in the Portuguese pidgin of the Eastern Seas, we must look, briefly, at the situation in the Philippines which conditioned their development there.

The Double Contact

For over two centuries after the initiation of the Spanish conquest of the Philippine Islands, Spain had no direct contact with her colony. Forbidden by Papal Bull and a treaty with Portugal to send ships eastwards on voyages of exploration, she was forced to approach the Philippines and the Moluccas—her primary objective—by way of America. It was not until the South American colonies had achieved their independence at the beginning of the nineteenth century that Spain really began to take an interest in her eastern colony, or that the Philippines came into direct contact with Spain.

It was during the nineteenth century, between the independence of Mexico and the annexation of the Philippines by the United States, that the inhabitants of Manila learned the Spanish which some of them still speak, a language whose main points of difference from the speech of Madrid—despite the *Diccionarios de Filipinismos*—lie in its slightly old-fashioned flavour (for it is, of course, the Spanish of fifty years ago) and its peculiarly correct pronunciation, that beautifully exact enunciation typical of any language not in common use and preserved by an upper

[1] A. L. Kroeber, *Anthropology*, revised edition, New York, 1948, pp. 368–370.

class in the face of competition from more popular languages. It is essential to understand that the modern Spanish of Manila has none of the characteristics of the South American or Andalusian Spanish which we must postulate to explain the contact vernaculars. The Philippine Spanish of today is the result of the second stage of the Spanish contact with the Philippines; the contact vernaculars preserve the features of an earlier period, when the Spanish of the Philippines resembled, or was perhaps identical with, the Spanish of Mexico, with its *seseo*, aspirate *h*, and other archaic or non-Castilian features.

Spain, as I have said, did not really take an interest in the Philippines until after the loss of her American empire. She had found no gold or spices in the Islands, and after she was forced to recognize that the Moluccas fell within the Portuguese hemisphere, they were of no further use as a base of operations against the Portuguese. But during this early period she had already acquired certain responsibilities in the Islands, in particular the protection of the numerous missions at work among the natives, and was therefore forced to maintain a garrison there. But the Philippines were not colonized on anything approaching the scale of the South American colonial venture, as is amply demonstrated by the fact that the yearly Manila galleon—there were two which made the double trip between Acapulco and Manila in two years—was found adequate to handle the limited traffic, consisting mainly of soldiers, priests, and administrators and their families.

Classes of Immigrants

Contact vernaculars arise, normally, from the contact of European and indigene, and it is usually necessary, therefore, to consider which class or stratum of the European trading or immigrant community is likely to be responsible for the genesis of the marginal tongue. But we know that the first contact of the Spaniards with the Malayan substratum to give birth to a contact vernacular was made on Ternate in the Moluccas; and, moreover, that a contact vernacular based on Portuguese was already in use in that area.

Nevertheless it is instructive to consider the various classes of Spanish immigrants in the Philippines, in the first place because the Moluccas were administered from the Philippines and were likely to have contact with the same types of people, and in the second place because the development of the vernaculars in the Philippines was to a certain extent affected by them—not, perhaps, in Cavite, where the creolized vernacular was simply the native language of the immigrant Ternateño community, but in Zamboanga, and again in Davao, where a variety of genetic problem again presents itself.

All the evidence leads us to suppose that it was the garrison troops who were responsible for the rise of the contact vernaculars; but we shall glance briefly also at the other classes of immigrants to understand why they could have had little or no part in the propagation of the dialects.

The administrators were all Peninsula-born Spaniards (speaking therefore, for the most part, correct Castilian), usually members of the lesser

aristocracy (and thus the less likely to have any intimate contact with the natives), few in number, and, if they were not accompanied to the Islands by their wives and families, they normally returned to Spain to marry. The colonists are in much the same case, for there were exceedingly few peasant colonists in the Philippines (none in the Moluccas), and they were usually members of the lesser nobility, who were granted blocks of land, left their estates to the care of an intendant, and formed a select society in Manila. The merchants, as a class, we may also dismiss, for they were almost all Chinese, and the trade-language of Ternate was a Portuguese pidgin. Such international trade as there was with the Philippines was handled by the Manila galleon, and European merchants were not interested in setting up small-profit enterprises in the inter-island traffic.

The priests and the members of the various religious orders, Augustinians, Franciscans, Dominicans, Jesuits, and Recollects, formed quite the most important single class in the Philippines, and they had far more intimate contact with the native population than any of the preceding groups, but in their dealings with the natives they did not employ Spanish. The priest learned the native language before leaving Manila, from one of the numerous grammars of native languages which were the first products of the Filipino press, and preached and taught in the native language. He taught Spanish only to an exceptionally intelligent native youth whom he had destined for the university in Manila, and ultimately, Holy Orders.

The garrison troops are clearly the Spanish-speaking class who would have most influence on the languages we are investigating. They were people of the lower social classes, often Mexican *mestizos* themselves, wifeless—since they could not afford to bring out wives from home—and almost entirely free from colour-prejudice. It is true that not even the administrative aristocrats had any racial prejudice in the Germanic or Anglo-Saxon sense, but, simply as aristocrats and concerned with the purity of their lineage, they were not as likely to intermarry with natives as the largely illiterate soldiery.[2]

Other contact vernaculars have become creolized, i.e. have become the mother tongue of native communities, without its being necessary for us to postulate the intermarriage of indigene and European. But the dialects we are investigating are not in any sense trade-languages or *lingue franche* (although they had their origin in a trade-language, as we shall see), and creolization occurs most typically among the emigrant communities of Negro slaves, speaking mutually incomprehensible tongues. Only the convivence, and indeed intermarriage, of Spaniard and Malay can account for the fact that a creolized language emerged in the brief space of two generations.

[2] For further details on all the foregoing see my article, 'Spanish in the Philippines', *Journal of Oriental Studies* (Hong Kong), I, 1 (January 1954), pp. 129–194.

The First Contact: Ternate

The first Spanish contact vernacular arose, not in the Philippines at all, but in the Moluccas, on the island of Ternate. Although we know, as a matter of certain fact, that two hundred families described in contemporary texts as *malayos*, who were already speaking a peculiar language of their own, a kind of 'corrupt Spanish',[3] were evacuated from Ternate to Manila in the seventeenth century, when the Spaniards decided to withdraw the garrison for additional support in resisting the threatened invasion by the Chinese pirate Koxinga, we can find nowhere, in accounts of Ternate in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, any reference to a 'pidgin Spanish' spoken in the Moluccas; and accounts of the most important period for our purpose, between 1606 and 1660, are scarce, despite the abundance of material dealing with the Portuguese period before the Spanish occupation of Ternate, and with the Dutch occupation after the Spanish. The origin of the Ternateño dialect is, in fact, exceedingly obscure.

Ternate lies today in one of the backwaters of the world. A small island of twenty-five square miles, it consists of an active volcano, with three superimposed cones, which rises to a height of five thousand four hundred feet. It has a good harbour which is now scarcely used, since there is no longer any trade, and a population of some three thousand Malay Moslems.[4]

But Ternate in the sixteenth century was something very different. Ternate was the name not only of an island but of an empire.[5] Before the twelfth century there were no political organizations in the Moluccas, and the kingdom of Ternate was a vassal of one of the Javanese states,

[3] Since educated Spanish-speaking Manileños still speak of the contact vernaculars as 'corrupt Spanish' we do not have to suppose that this language was anything other than a contact vernacular.

[4] Descriptions of the island of Ternate at different periods in its history may be found in various authors: António Galvão (*anglice* Galvano), *The Discoveries of the World*, London: The Hakluyt Society, 1862, pp. 119–20 (this is a reprint of *The Discovery of the World written in the Portugal tongue by Antonio Galvano, Governor of Ternate. Published in English by Richard Hakluyt*, London, 1601, and of the Portuguese original by Galvão, Lisbon, 1563); Alfred Russell Wallace, *The Malay Archipelago*, two volumes, London, 1869, Chapter XXI; Albert S. Bickmore, *Travels in the East Indian Archipelago*, London, 1868, Chapter IX; H. M. Tomlinson, *Tidemarks: Records of Journeys to Beaches of the Moluccas*, London, 1932, Chapters XXIV and XXV.

[4] There is extant a readily accessible engraving of Ternate at the beginning of the eighteenth century. The original appears in François Valentijn, *Oud en Nieuw Oost Indiën*, Amsterdam, 1724–6, but is reprinted in Bernard H. M. Vlekke, *Nusantara, A History of the East Indian Archipelago*, Harvard University Press, 1943; in *The Voyage of Sir Henry Middleton to the Moluccas, 1604–1606*, edited by Sir William Foster, London: The Hakluyt Society, 1943; and in James Brodrick, S.J., *Saint Francis Xavier*, London, 1952.

[5] For some indication of the extent of this empire see Harry W. Hazard, *Atlas of Islamic History*, Princeton University Press, 1951, p. 43; or R. R. Sellman, *An Outline Atlas of Eastern History*, London, 1954, Map 34, p. 37. In 1580 no less than seventy-two islands recognized the suzerainty of Ternate.

probably established by the Javanese. But by the sixteenth century the domain of the Sultan of Ternate extended from Timor in the south, over the eastern part of Celebes in the west, and over large parts of Halmahera in the east.

The sway of Ternate in this area was not, however, undisputed, for alongside the empire of Ternate lay the empire of Tidor—Tidor, twin island to Ternate. It is with the fortunes of these two tiny islands that we shall be concerned here, for they were not only the capitals of their empires, but were the most attractive islands in the whole of the Celebes Sea—they were the Spice Islands.[6]

Moslem traders, mainly Indian with a sprinkling of Arabs and native Malays,[7] knew of the value of spices long before any Europeans appeared in the eastern seas, and a flourishing trade had grown up in the Moluccas, monopolized by the Moslems, who, with their trade, had contrived to spread their religion.[8]

Then in 1511, Malacca, at once the major trading-centre in the Far East and the focal point for Islam west of India, fell to the forces of Albuquerque, who, losing no time, dispatched the same year an expedition to the Moluccas to break the Moslem monopoly of the spice trade.

From small beginnings the Portuguese gradually built up an important empire. Although the 1511 expedition, under António d'Abreu, met with disaster, one of the shipwrecked victims, Francisco Serrão, reached Ternate after a series of adventures, and secured certain trading-concessions for the Portuguese. But it was not until 1521, when the *Victoria* under Elcano reached Ternate and made the Portuguese realize the need for a permanent garrison, that the first factory was established; and not until 1522 that the first fort was built by António Brito, after much importuning by the rival sultans of Ternate and Tidor, each promising to recognize Portuguese suzerainty in return for assistance in their chronic wars. Under the governorship of António Galvão (1536–40) the Portuguese extended their authority over all the Moluccas, putting an end to the internecine strife of Ternate and Tidor; while the empire of Ternate, under Sultan Hairun, who, as Francis Xavier records, was proud to talk

[6] The original home of the clove was a small group of islands off the western coast of Halmahera—Ternate, Tidor, and a very few others—and certain areas of the neighbouring shores of Halmahera itself.

[7] Malacca was the most important centre until 1511. After that date Acheh became the stronghold of Islam in Malaysia, and from there the Moslem religion spread to Ulakan and Minangkabau. From then on Malay 'missionaries' predominated in the eastern seas, and it was a Minangkabau trader who converted the Celebes in the seventeenth century.

[8] The Moslem 'missionaries' were essentially different from the early Christian missionaries in that they were not professionals, and conversion, as it happened, was as simple a matter as the baptism without instruction which was practised by the Portuguese missionaries, for it involved no more than the confession of faith ('There is only one God, Allah, and Mohammed is his prophet'), which meant little more than the relegation of all local gods to the rank of demons, and the observance of the Five Pillars, which were, in fact, infrequently observed.

See especially Kenneth Perry Landon, *South East Asia: Crossroads of Religion*, University of Chicago Press, 1947.

of 'the king of Portugal, my Lord',[9] was extended from Mindanao to Amboyna.

Portuguese authority was, however, short-lived. In 1565 a fleet had to be sent from Goa to restore order in the islands, and almost immediately the Portuguese governor of Ternate precipitated a war by attempting to rob Hairun of his share in the clove-trade. Scarcely was a reconciliation effected, in 1570, when the murder of the Sultan provoked a revolt, led by his son Baabullah, which by 1574 had driven the Portuguese from Ternate. By 1575 they were barely holding on to Amboyna, and they were saved only by the union of the crowns of Spain and Portugal in 1580.[10]

The Spaniards, however, were not able at once to reoccupy Ternate. They took immediate and peaceful possession of Amboyna, but it was not until thirty-two years after the Portuguese withdrawal that they could recover Ternate. In 1599 a Spanish fleet from Manila and a Portuguese fleet from Amboyna, under Furtado de Mendoza, sailed to Ternate, but were repulsed by a Dutch garrison which had occupied the island. The Dutch thereupon formed an alliance with the natives of Amboyna, and in 1604–5 drove the Portuguese from the island, capturing Tidor also the same year. But in 1606 Spanish supremacy was re-established when a fleet from the Philippines destroyed the Sultanate of Ternate and occupied Tidor; and though the Sultan of Ternate, preferring Dutch tolerance to the militant Catholicism of Spain and Portugal,[11] signed a treaty with the Dutch in 1607, the Dutch, despite an important naval victory in December of 1615, failed to dislodge the Spaniards.[12]

[9] See Brodrick, *op. cit.*, p. 282.

[10] For the details of this complicated period in the history of the Moluccas see such works as Vlekke's *Nusantara, cit. supra*, and H. J. de Graaf, *Geschiedenis van Indonesië*, The Hague, 1949.

[11] Early in the century Italian Jesuits had protested against the policy of Portuguese government officers, a policy which was strictly commercial, on the grounds that the only way to secure the propagation of the Catholic faith was to annihilate the Moslem Sultanate of Ternate. In 1546 Francis Xavier was thwarted less by the cupidity of the officials than by their brutality. The policy of the early Italian Jesuits never was, in fact, put into effect in the Moluccas, and Moluccan preference for the Dutch was not a protest against any kind of persecution, but simply a protest against interference and missionary-activity generally.

[12] During this interim period—between the Portuguese and Spanish occupations of the island—the English were also not unconcerned with the fate of the clove-trade. Drake visited Ternate in 1579, and Sir James Lancaster attempted to secure concessions in 1591. The Middletons were sent for the same purpose at the beginning of the seventeenth century. See Sir William Foster, *England's Quest of Eastern Trade*, London, 1933, pp. 167 *et seq.*, for an account of Sir Henry Middleton's voyage, and also *The Voyage of Sir Henry Middleton to the Moluccas, cit. supra*. David Middleton, a few years later, found the Sultan of Ternate and the Dutch experiencing severe reverses at the hands of the Spaniards, a situation quite the contrary of that described by his brother.

For an account of the conquest of the Moluccas by Spain, the standard authority is Leonardo de Argensola, *Conquista de las Islas Molucas*, Madrid, 1609, which is available in English, French, and Dutch translations. An account of the recapture of one of the many islands may be found in the 'Relación de Don Diego de Prado', 1607, a MS which is printed, with a translation, in *New Light on the Discovery of Australia*, London: The Hakluyt Society, 1929.

The Dutch did not, however, abandon the struggle. In 1655 they managed to destroy the clove-trees on Ternate, and shortly afterwards the Spaniards began their withdrawal from the Moluccas. The two hundred families, who were first evacuated to Manila, were settled at Tanza and the new Ternate in 1660, so we must presume that they left the Moluccas in 1658 or 1659. In 1662 the Spaniards withdrew from Zamboanga, whence the Moluccas were administered, because of the attacks of pirates, Moslem and Chinese; and finally, in 1663, they completed the evacuation of Ternate and Tidor, withdrawing the remaining troops to meet the threat of invasion of the Philippines by the Chinese pirate Koxinga. In any case, the islands were now valueless, since cloves had been established on many other islands, and the wild trees of the clove's homeland had been destroyed.

It is during this troubled period, therefore, 1606—c. 1658, that we must situate the growth of the Ternateño vernacular, that peculiar variety of 'corrupt Spanish' which was to give birth to four more dialects in the Philippines.

Portuguese Pidgin and Ternateño

The only languages which had achieved any currency as *lingue franche* in the Eastern Seas during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were Portuguese and Malay, and most European traders, including the Dutch and the English, made use of Portuguese.[13] All the authorities are unanimous in their affirmations: in this early period, Portuguese, not always of the purest variety, was the common language of European traders.[14] We have seen that there was an interval of thirty-two years (1574–1606) between the Portuguese evacuation and the Spanish occupation of the Moluccas. This does not mean, however, that there was any period during which Portuguese was not spoken there, for the Dutch were trading at Ternate, and would certainly make use of the Portuguese tongue.[15]

It is easy, giving the imagination free rein, to picture the circumstances on Ternate which could have given birth to a Spanish contact vernacular—the Spanish garrison, a group of lonely, semi-literate men,

[13] Even at the beginning of the eighteenth century English trade at Canton was carried on through Eurasian Portuguese interpreters, who translated the Cantonese into a Portuguese pidgin comprehensible to the English sailors.

[14] The standard work on this subject is David Lopes, *A Expansão da Língua Portuguesa no Oriente nos Séculos XVI, XVII e XVIII*, Barcelos, 1936. Professor Lopes adduces a mass of evidence, from contemporary documents and travellers' notebooks, on the diffusion of Portuguese over Persia, India, Malaysia, and even China and Japan; but it is not always clear—indeed from the references in the sources it is often impossible to tell—whether the Portuguese referred to is pure Portuguese or the trade-language.

[15] For a long time Dutch policy in Indonesia was deliberately to discourage the natives' acquiring any knowledge of Dutch. In Java itself, even in the nineteenth century, more of the local populace knew Portuguese than Dutch. See G. H. Bousanquet, *A French View of the Netherlands Indies*, London and New York, 1940.

without the collective training to learn easily the native language, and probably without individual linguistic inclination, is left for a number of years on a lush tropical island; the officers may have kept to themselves; but the men would be sure to mix freely with the native population, and especially with the native women; they would then, inevitably, attempt to teach the natives Spanish, not correct grammatical Spanish, but merely a vocabulary sufficient for elementary communication, with the minimum of particles and flexions; and then, gradually, the natives learning and using the vocabulary required of them, the soldiers accommodating themselves to the natives' analogical simplifications, the new jargon would arise. This is precisely the type of speculation one is forced to indulge in to explain the genesis of almost every contact vernacular; but for Ternateño we may fill in the picture more precisely.

In the first place, we know that the two hundred families who were evacuated to Manila with part of the garrison were Christian. We may surmise that they chose to leave their homes partly because they feared persecution at the hands of the Moslems after the Spaniards had gone,[16] partly because they were Christians by virtue of intermarriage with Spaniards, probably because of a combination of both reasons.[17] Separately, let us consider the implications of these two factors.

As I have noted already, it was the policy of the religious orders and the priests in the Philippines to use the native languages in all dealings with the native populace, and the same policy might have obtained in the Moluccas. But it is not safe to assume that there was a complete break in Christian tradition on Ternate, despite a generation's interval, between 1574 and 1606—the Spanish priests who accompanied the occupation troops would not be faced with the task of converting a group of natives who knew no other language besides their native dialect, but of rehabilitating a Christian community which, thanks partly to the Dutch refusal to allow the natives to learn or employ Dutch, had not forgotten its Portuguese, a language not unintelligible to Spaniards.

Portuguese pidgin was certainly used in the Moluccas in the sixteenth century. Whether it had any more intimate connection with the Christian community or was simply the language of trade is a matter for conjecture, for we do not know what Portuguese ecclesiastical linguistic policy was

[16] 'Persecution' may be interpreted in a very general sense. On many of the smaller islands in the Moluccas, like Rau and Morotai ('Morty' to the English sailors), many thousands of natives accepted Christianity as the price of Portuguese protection against the slave-snatching Moslems. On the other hand, many of these were scarcely genuine converts, for in 1533–4 Simão Vaz and Francisco Alvares baptized between five and six thousand people without any instruction whatsoever, relying somewhat naïvely on the efficacy of the sacrament. This kind of practice accounts for the phenomenal numbers of 'converts' cited by Portuguese writers. See Brodrick, *op. cit.*, pp. 242 and 278.

[17] A typical case, though somewhat earlier than the period with which we are concerned, was the subject of one of Francis Xavier's letters (Brodrick, p. 350): a daughter of Sultan Baiang Ullah, half-sister of Sultan Hairun, married a Portuguese, Baltasar Veloso, and became a Christian; Hairun deprived her of her property and treated her very harshly for her apostasy, though this may have been because of rather than in spite of her close relationship with himself.

in this period. Francis Xavier, who ordered the Jesuit fathers at Goa to use Portuguese pidgin when instructing children and slaves—adding to this injunction the comment 'This was the language I myself used when I taught at Goa'[18]—made use of Portuguese, Spanish, and Malay on Ternate. It is difficult to see why he should have used Spanish; he would preach in Portuguese to the garrison troops; and his own Malay was very bad.[19] But he employed the Malay crew of his *coracora*, who knew Portuguese pidgin, as interpreters, and to drill his converts had his little book of essential texts, which he had had translated into Malay at Malacca. At this time, in fact, in 1546, it seems that it was still necessary to use Malay to communicate with the ordinary inhabitants of Ternate, even though it is reported that the Sultan, Hairun, 'spoke very good Portuguese'.[20] We must bear in mind, however, that St Francis was bent on making converts from among the Malay Moslems—there may have been already at that time a number of Malays acquainted with Portuguese, perhaps already converted to Christianity, married perhaps to Portuguese soldiers. That there were some, we know—only the size of this community is uncertain.

In short, at the time of the Spanish occupation of Ternate, the Spanish troops would find a small Christian community, united in the face of Moslem persecution, and so the readier to welcome the Spaniards, which had already a fair knowledge of a pidgin variety of Portuguese, a language which was now well on the way to becoming the *lingua franca* of the Orient, and which would be the dearer to them for its religious connections. With the members of this community the Spanish troops would soon be on friendly terms, holding converse of a kind with them through the medium of a mixed Portuguese-Spanish pidgin. In other words, the Ternateño vernacular which reached the Philippines in 1558 was not the result of contact between Spanish and a Malay dialect, but of Spanish and a Portuguese-Malay pidgin[21]—which, incidentally, in

[18] Brodrick, *op. cit.*, p. 393.

[19] Despite the popular legends according to which St Francis was supposed to be miraculously endowed with the 'gift of tongues', it seems that he was not a very good linguist, but contrived a system, relying on translators, by which he obtained versions of crucial texts—the Creed, Pater Noster, Ave Maria, the Ten Commandments, the General Confession, etc. (for his own list see the letter in *Epistolæ S. Francisci Xaverii*, edited by Georg Schurhammer, S.J., and Joseph Wicki, S.J., 1943–4, I, pp. 377–8, partly quoted in Brodrick, *op. cit.*, p. 273)—in the required language, Tamil, or Malay, or Japanese, and learned the sounds off parrot-fashion in order to preach.

[20] Francis Xavier, in a letter, quoted in Brodrick, *op. cit.*, p. 283.

[21] This much at least is not mere guess-work. The similarities in grammar and syntax, and even of vocabulary, between the Spanish contact vernaculars in the Philippines and Indo-Portuguese, are so many—and they are not attributable to a common substratum—that we can be quite certain that Ternateño did develop out of the common Portuguese pidgin of the Eastern Seas. Very little work has been done on this Portuguese *lingua franca* (I am not forgetting H. Schuchardt, Coelho, Dalgado, or Leite de Vasconcellos)—on its origins, dialectal varieties, etc.—and by 'Portuguese-Malay pidgin' I mean no more than that type of Portuguese pidgin used in the Malay Archipelago, with whatever admixture of Malay words or syntactical patterns it may or may not have taken on in that area.

turn may not have been a 'pure' contact vernacular, but a kind of imitation of Sabir, the Lingua Franca of the Mediterranean.

Even given these favourable conditions, however, it is difficult to explain the creolization of the Ternateño vernacular in the short space of two generations without postulating an even more intimate contact between the community which was eventually to be evacuated with the garrison, and the garrison troops. We may imagine this small Christian community becoming more and more dependent on the military garrison, cut off from their fellow-Malays by their Catholicism. If the community was bilingual in Malay and Ternateño in the early days, the native language would be not a bond but a barrier between the Malay Christians and the soldiers, and the community might ultimately become monoglot in the contact vernacular. But there is no other instance of the creolization of a contact vernacular under these circumstances alone. Creolization occurs among a group of people united by common interests, who, apart from their common contact vernacular, speak mutually unintelligible tongues, such as emigrant communities of negro slaves in the Americas. Or it occurs in communities of mixed blood, unable or unwilling to return to the religion, customs, and language of their mothers, and yet a social grade lower than their fathers' compatriots, and unable to play a full part in the life of the community to which they feel they rightly belong. This would not, of course, apply to the creolized vernaculars of the Philippines or to the communities which use them, but only to the community in which the contact vernacular became creolized, that is the Ternateño community.

The process we must postulate must be something as follows: some of the Spanish soldiers (some of them Mexican *mestizos* themselves) marry with native women (some of them, perhaps, the descendants of Portuguese soldiers) and produce children who hear their parents speaking to each other in the language we have permitted ourselves to call 'Ternateño'. At this stage, if neither parent makes progress in acquiring the native language of the other, the process of creolization is virtually complete.[22] The native language would be forgotten by the group of Eurasian Christian families, and the complexities of standard Spanish would not be acquired, since the vernacular would still be intelligible to Spaniards and would not yet have reached a stage where it would have to be learned by a Spaniard as a Frenchman must learn Mauricien or an Englishman Ningre-Tongo.

I have devoted a good deal of space to the hypothetical history of Ternateño, a language of which no text or sample exists, whose name I have coined, and of which no mention is made in any save one document. But Ternateño is important, simply because in the history of any contact vernacular the most important consideration is the problem

[22] The children of immigrant Italians, Poles, Hungarians, etc., in the United States frequently grow up with only a smattering of the language of their parents. The case is not, of course, parallel, but it does illustrate with great force one simple fact—that, in one sense, no language is more than one generation old, and that linguistic habits *can* be altered, although they rarely are, with fantastic rapidity

of its genesis, and one fact at least is certain: that the first of the Spanish contact vernaculars in the Eastern Seas arose in Ternate, and had already achieved creolization before the evacuation of the island by garrison and Christian inhabitants. We do not know exactly what this language was like, but it cannot have been much different from Ermitaño or Caviteño, stripped of the elements of Tagalog vocabulary and syntax which entered them later, and probably with more Portuguese elements. We may be fairly sure that it was grammatically less systematized.

The conditions under which the Ternateño vernacular arose will do little or nothing to explain any features of the four Philippine dialects with which we are to be concerned. It is impossible to be sure of any psychological substratum in the Philippine dialects but Tagalog, and the present vocabularies of these languages give little indication of their chequered careers. All that the study of Ternateño does clarify is the origin of these dialects, which would otherwise be well-nigh impossible to explain, for circumstances in the Philippines, and certainly in the areas where these languages are found, are such that it is extremely unlikely that any contact vernacular would have arisen without the example of Ternateño.

Manila

The two hundred families from Ternate were settled at first in Manila, in the Campo de Bagong-Bayan ('new town'), now the Luneta Park, in the modern municipal district of Ermita, just south of the walled city of Intramuros, and north of the Tagalog villages of Ermita and Malate.[23]

Manila, or Maynilà, was already a populous settlement when Legazpi arrived there in 1570. But the native settlement was in the marshes to the north of the Pasig River. Legazpi built his fort to the south, laying the foundations of the oldest part of the modern city of Manila, the now almost totally destroyed district of Intramuros. Gradually the Spanish settlement expanded north of the river, but until the end of the nineteenth century Intramuros remained a stronghold of Spanish in a Tagalog-speaking city.

The newcomers from Ternate, encamped outside Intramuros, were soon involved in an endless series of quarrels with the Tagalogs to the south, so that it was finally decided to evacuate the community a second time, to the province of Cavite, south-west of Manila.

Caviteño

When the Spaniards arrived in Manila there were already certain centres of population in the present province of Cavite, at Kawit, Bacoor, and Maragondon. Then, in 1641, the Spaniards established an important naval yard on the Cavite Peninsula, out of which grew the City of Cavite. The people from Ternate were settled, not in existing villages—the

[23] For this and several other important items of information I am indebted to Dr Jaime C. de Veyra, who allowed me to read the relevant sections of his unpublished 'Historia regional de las literaturas hispánicas'.

authorities fearing, no doubt, a repetition of the Manila incidents—but in new settlements, at Tanza, and neighbouring San Roque, and in the new Ternate. This was in 1660.[24] The patron saint of Tanza, the Santo Niño of Prague, is, significantly, the patron saint of Ternate also.[25]

One of the contact vernaculars with which we are here concerned is Caviteño. Direct documentary evidence is lacking, but we cannot escape the conclusion that Caviteño is the modern descendant of Ternateño. Before the war Caviteño was the common language of Tanza, San Roque, and Ternate, and it had spread to one or two other towns, in particular Cavite City, we may presume because of an influx of Ternateños to work in the dockyards.

Its hold in Cavite City itself had been weakened long before the war by a considerable immigration of Ilokos during the twenties, and the war saw the utter destruction of the old walled city of Cavite. Families were scattered, and though the Caviteño-speaking community held together surprisingly well, moving itself almost *en masse* to the town of Caridad,[26] the disruptive influence of the war has set the language into a decline from which there is no good reason that it should ever recover. It was estimated in 1942 that there were 18,000 speakers of Caviteño[27] but another generation may well see its complete extinction. The circumstances which attended the birth of the language are no longer active, and Caviteño is now less a bond than a barrier to communication with native or Spaniard alike, and, although I was unable to visit Cavite Province, because of Hukbalahup disturbances, I suspect, from conversations with Caviteño-speakers in Manila, that there are few speakers of the language who do not now know English, which will become, inevitably, the language of the next generation.

Ermitaño

Although we are told that the two hundred families from Ternate were all evacuated to Cavite, I think there can be no reasonable doubt but that Ternateño, if it is not the direct ancestor of Ermitaño, played at least an important part in its genesis.

Professor De Veyra has stated that it differs from Caviteño only by its greater correction, by contact with correct Spanish. While this may be broadly true, it is not quite exact. Ermitaño does, indeed, show a markedly nearer approximation to the sound-system of Spanish—*e* and *o*, for instance, are not raised to *i* and *u* as they frequently are in Caviteño—and there are frequent lapses in Ermitaño texts, which will

[24] We know that Ternate, at least, was founded in 1660. See Reyes and Santamaría, *Pictorial History of the Philippines*, Quezon City, 1953.

[25] According to Dr De Veyra.

[26] I am indebted for this item of information, and for all subsequently cited estimates of the numbers of speakers of each language, to Dr H. Otley Beyer, who allowed me to see the notes for his unpublished Community Assembly Lectures.

[27] Professor Beyer's estimate.

sometimes show an adjective taking a feminine or plural form, as in Spanish; but the grammar of Ermitaño, particularly with regard to its verb system, is no way closer to Spanish than Caviteño. The 'greater correction' of Ermitaño applies to little more than its sound-system.

In comparison with Caviteño, Ermitaño is simpler. Its conjugational system admits only three simple tenses,[28] whereas in Caviteño a complex system of particles, with reduplication, permits of considerable subtlety, and adequate expression of almost all the Spanish modes, aspects and tenses.[29] In short, I believe that Ermitaño has at the same time preserved the Ternateño dialect in its archaic form—while Caviteño has made further innovations—and in some cases has 'corrected' it by imitating Spanish forms. Ermita, we must remember, lies outside the walls of Intramuros, where nothing but the purest, albeit American, Spanish was spoken.

The Ermitaño dialect generalized itself in the district of Ermita, and was adopted by Tagalogs who came into contact with the community, since, although it had none of the grammatical complexities of Spanish, it was still largely comprehensible to the Spanish-speaking community of Manila. Naturally the reproduction of 'contact-vernacular conditions' in Ermita—a native community living alongside a Spanish community, the enlistment of Tagalog troops in the Spanish garrison forces, the cosmopolitan atmosphere of the capital (although Manila did not become a focus for immigration from the islands until the present century)—would assist the propagation of the language.

Again, a decline set in at the turn of the nineteenth century. The centre of the city had shifted north of the river to the maze of narrow streets covering the present municipal districts of San Nicolás, Binondo, Quiapo, and the southern section of Santa Cruz. Intramuros, thick with magnificent churches, had become one of the poorest quarters of the city. The aristocratic district *par excellence* was round Malacañang; and close behind it came the district of Ermita, where the American administrators chose to build their houses, crowding out the wooden shacks with their palm-leaf roofs.

In 1942 there were still 12,000 people who spoke Ermitaño[30] but the last phases of the war, namely the disastrous campaign of the Liberation, reduced Ermita to a shambles. Ermita today consists of huge areas of rubble, with the ruins of the Ateneo (the Jesuit college), the Manila Museum, and the General Hospital; large modern buildings, hotels, blocks of flats, the American Embassy, the United Nations Building,[31] the former site of the University of the Philippines, and so on; and the native shacks, crowding in where they can, often under the shelter of roofless walls. Ermita, the fishing village of *Na Maldito Arena*, our

[28] They are not strictly 'tenses' at all, but for the moment they may conveniently be regarded as such. See Grammar V, 14.

[29] See Grammar V, 14 and VII, 18*c*.

[30] Professor Beyer's estimate.

[31] Closed down in 1954.

first text, no longer exists. Here and there only does one find some member of an older generation who still remembers the time when the language was spoken in every home in the district.

Zamboangueño

By 1631 missionaries were already firmly established in the north of the present province of Zamboanga, in Mindanao, and in the interior round Lake Lanao, in modern Lanao Province, attempting to convert the Moslems and pagans of the area; but no missions had ventured to the south, to the strongholds of the Moro pirates in the Sulu Archipelago; and the attacks of the sea-rovers on the northern settlements became more and more daring. The Spanish answer to this threat was the retrenchment of the area of settlement and the expansion of the outer line of defence, by means of a series of watch-towers, galleon patrols, and outlying forts. One such fort was Fort Pilar, the nucleus of modern Zamboanga City.

It was built by a Jesuit engineer after Don Juan de Chávez had chosen the south-western tip of Mindanao to establish a garrison, in 1631. But the Moro attacks forced the Spaniards to abandon fort and settlement in 1662. It was not until 1719 that they returned to Zamboanga, and began rebuilding the fort whose massive walls still stand intact.

The garrison consisted of Mexicans, reinforced by Tagalogs from Manila, and some Visayans. It is more than probable that many of the Tagalog troops spoke Ermitaño or Caviteño, and the conditions which had prevailed in Ternate in the Moluccas were here repeated all over again—the intimate convivence of Spanish-speakers with natives, isolated by a common enemy, and the intermarriage of illiterate troops with non-Spanish-speaking women. I take it that Zamboangueño is a semi-independent growth, germinated and perhaps controlled by the use of other contact vernaculars among the garrison soldiers. That it cannot be an entirely independent growth is demonstrated by the fact that its verbal system is identical with that of Ermitaño and Caviteño.

The Spaniards called this new dialect 'Chavacano', a pejorative term which Chavacano-speakers like to explain as 'mixed'. It is possible, and indeed probable, that it was originally much more 'mixed' than it is today, but I cannot agree with Professor Beyer that it is 'a mixture of Spanish, Moro languages, Visayan dialects, and Subanun'. The basic languages of the contact are clearly Tagalog, Cebuano, and Spanish. The absence of other elements is indeed one reason for connecting Zamboangueño with Ermitaño and Caviteño.

Dr Beyer estimated in 1942 that there were 1,300 speakers of Zamboangueño. Zamboanga suffered during the war, and among its lamentable casualties were the entire files of its Spanish newspaper *El Imparcial*, which contained, among other things, a daily column written in Chavacano. But, though Zamboanga City was destroyed, the population was not scattered, and Zamboangueño has fared best, perhaps, of all the contact vernaculars. It is still in common use in Zamboanga City and the surrounding villages. Indeed, it appears to be used extensively in the interior of the province. There does not seem to be, however, any clear standard of Chavacano, and one hears everything from a dialect thickly larded with Tagalog and Visayan words, to one in which the effects of Spanish contamination are clearly perceptible, for Spanish too is more vigorous in Zamboanga City than in almost any other place in the Philippines. This language also, therefore, is doomed to extinction, and that adprobably in the space of another generation.

Davaueño

There is no mystery about the origin of the fourth contact vernacular. Davaueño, also referred to humorously as 'Abakay Spanish',[32] is the direct descendant of Zamboangueño.

The region which is the modern Davao Province was ceded to Spain by the Sultan of Mindanao in 1844. In 1847 Don José Oyanguren led a successful expedition against the local tribes in what is now Davao City, and founded a settlement which he named Vergara. In 1849 he organized the modern province under the name of Nueva Guipúzcoa. But, before the turn of the century, the region round Davao was only very sparsely inhabited, by the primitive Bagobos, Manobos, Agoros and so on. The influx of Filipinos—for Tagalog and Cebuano Filipinos do not reckon that the non-Christian tribes of Mindanao are Filipinos at all—did not begin until 1900, after the beginning of the American administration.

In 1900 a considerable colony arrived from Zamboanga, and settled along the strip which is now Bonifacio Street. This community spoke Zamboangueño, and the language is still employed in the family circles. But it is slowly dying out, for it has not spread outside the Chavacano community. Prominent Chavacano citizens have an excellent command of English and Spanish, while the children of a majority of the families speak and are educated in Tagalog or one of the Visayan dialects, usually Cebuano. Only a few members of the older generation remember Zamboangueño folk-songs, and the dialect has never found its way into print in Davao, as it did in Zamboanga. The dialect is preserved in Davao in much purer form than in Zamboanga, and regularly forms the future with *ay* instead of the *de* of modern Zamboangueño, Caviteño, Ermitaño and Indo-Portuguese.

Professor Beyer says that Davaueño is a 'mixture' of Spanish and Japanese with two or three native languages, and notes that the modern dialect has discarded many Japanese terms, since the plantation owners are no longer Japanese, and consists now more of Spanish and Tagalog, with Visayan and Bagobo elements.

Although I have labelled this section, and the version current in Davao of the contact vernacular we have been pursuing 'Davaueño', the language known as 'Davaueño' in Davao is something quite different. The first settlers were the Zamboangueño community and political exiles from

[32] From *abaca*, a variety of hemp extensively cultivated round Davao.

Manila, but thereafter the waves of immigrants seem to have been determined by the provenance of the Governor. The first Filipino Civil Governor of Davao, appointed in 1917, was a native of Cebu, and his governorship is marked by an influx of Cebuanos, who found work mainly as road-labourers, and settled in the area along the river. The second Governor was Francisco Sales from Leyte, and during his period of office there was an influx of Leyteños. The third, Attorney Chaves, was a Tagalog, and there was a rather less important Tagalog immigration. The result of this Filipino linguistic mixture is interesting. There arose the dialect known as 'Davaueño'—a synthesis of Tagalog with Cebuano and other Visayan dialects. The vocabulary, like that of Tagalog, contains a number of Spanish words, and a few from the non-Christian dialects of the area. There are two forms: the Davaueño spoken on the east coast of Davao where ninety per cent of the population are Davaueños, and that spoken in the city itself and its environs. The coastal dialect is older and 'purer' than the city dialect, which now contains a good deal of English. The dialect is not written, and when Davaueños have occasion to correspond with Davaueños they write Tagalog or Cebuano, not, however, without lapses.

Besides Zamboangueño there was another interesting variation on standard Spanish in use in Davao up to 1945. This was known locally as 'Bamboo Spanish'. There were 28,000 Japanese settlers in Davao before they were expelled after the campaign of the Liberation, and the language which served as a medium of communication with the Filipinos—it even found its way into the courtroom—was a Spanish of greatly simplified grammatical structure, though quite distinct from Chavacano. Its most striking characteristic seems to have been the use of curious periphrases and paraphrases which had achieved a certain degree of standardization. For 'When were you born?' the Japanese—and the Filipino attempting to communicate with him—would eschew entirely the verb *nacer*, and paraphrase: 'Cuando sale ikaw nanay?'; for 'What is the name of your wife?' the formula was 'Nombre oksan tiene?', with deformation of the Japanese word.[33]

The same dialect, I am informed, is still spoken by the older generation of Chinese shopkeepers in Davao, but I have been unable to ascertain that it is identical with the 'Bamboo Spanish' of the former Japanese community.

According to Professor Beyer there were, in 1942, 3,500 speakers of Davaueño in Davao. The figure squares with that of the Zamboangueño community—there are a very great many more speakers of the other 'Davaueño' now—but the description he gives of the language (see above) does not. Nevertheless I think that we may accept the figure and the label, for Davao Chavacano, isolated for fifty years from Zamboanga Chavacano, is no longer identical with it, and 'Davaueño' is perhaps the most convenient term at our disposal. It is only necessary to remember

[33] For most of the foregoing information I am indebted to Attorney Manuel Carbaguio of Davao.

that in Davao 'Davaueño' means something different, and that 'Bamboo Spanish' is not the same as 'Abakay Spanish'.

Affiliation

It is clear that these four contact vernaculars are essentially one and the same, all descended more or less directly from Ternateño. I would show their affiliation thus:

Century
16th
Ternateño
17th
Caviteño Ermitaño
18th
Zamboangueño
19th
Davaueño
20th

CHAPTER II

THE SPELLING OF THE TEXTS

Guiding Principles—The *Seseo*—*B* and *V*—The Aspirate *H*—*F* and *P*—Intervocelic *D*—*L* and *R*—*NG*—Hispanization of Tagalog Words—Raising of Vowels—Accentuation.

In the texts which I here reprint—their provenance is explained elsewhere—I have not followed the original orthography of their authors and transcribers. Within each system I found inconsistencies, like Balmori's erratic rendering of the *seseo*, and each required some emendation, for there were several misprints which the transcribers clearly did not intend. Furthermore, each orthographic system differed to a greater or less extent from each of the others. Since, therefore, there exists no standard spelling for Ermitaño, Caviteño or Zamboangueño, and since one cannot pretend to give a phonetic transcription in the Latin alphabet, I have felt myself at liberty freely to alter the orthography of the originals in order to make them all conform to the same system.

If these were unrecorded languages of some obscure linguistic stock, it would be a clear case for the use of the International Phonetic Alphabet; but, although there is not and can never be any accepted orthography for these dialects, there have been sporadic attempts to create a literature for these tongues, or at least to employ them for literary purposes, so that the problem of 'reducing them to writing' has already been solved in several ways. In any case these languages are largely Spanish, and there seemed no point in obscuring the etymology of words and making a puzzle of the texts when a few words on the orthographical conventions I have adopted should suffice to clarify the divergencies between this system and that of standard Spanish.[1] I have relied on the phonetic transcriptions to indicate sporadic variations in the pronunciation of words, as well as consistent departures from standard Castilian pronunciation.

For comparison, the main points in which my system differs from those of my originals are the following:

The *seseo*. *Z* and C^{e-i} are pronounced in correct Philippine Spanish as [θ], as in Madrid. The transcribers of the contact vernaculars have all felt compelled, therefore, to indicate the regular *seseo* of the creolized languages by writing *S*. I have in every case retained the normal Spanish spelling, and write *cuci* [ku'si], instead of *cusi*. In any case the original texts are not consistent: Balmori (or the printer) has '*na celca de quinse*

[1] I am aware that Robert A. Hall Jr. in his model series of articles on the dialectology of Beach-la-Mar, a contact vernacular based on English, uses the I.P.A. throughout. But the radical changes which Beach-la-Mar has effected in the English sound-system, and the vagaries of standard English orthography, make such a procedure much more imperative than in our own case; it does, however, obscure the meaning of words, but since Hall does not make use of consecutive texts this is the less important.

años' despite the fact that *cerca* and *quince* are alike pronounced with the *seseo*. Again Balmori has tried to avoid obscuring the sense of his text by distinguishing between '*bos*' and '*boz*' (Spanish *vos* and *voz*) although there is no difference in the pronunciation. I feel there is no point in exaggerating the differences between the contact vernaculars and their parent tongue, and so I merely note here that *Z* and C^{e-i} are pronounced as [s] in all the contact vernaculars, as in the whole of South America and the south of Spain.

***B* and *V*.** In standard Spanish both initial *B* and initial *V* are pronounced as occlusive [b], while intervocalic *B* and *V* are the fricative [β]. In Ermitaño and Caviteño there used to be, it would seem, no fricative [β], since Balmori and Santos y Gómez alike render Spanish *B* and *V* by *B*, spelling '*bieja*' and '*probinsia*', to indicate, one must suppose, the occlusive [b]. But as the reader may see from the phonetic transcriptions, my modern speaker of Ermitaño uses a fricative [β] as regularly, almost, as any Spaniard, and my Caviteño speaker, less often, employs one also. This is undoubtedly due to Spanish contamination, but in the circumstances it seemed pointless to make the texts more difficult by substituting *B* for Spanish *V*. Furthermore, if my system were to be uniform for all three dialects, I needed *B* and *V*, for I had to distinguish between them in Zamboangueño: there a distinction is made, not, as in Spanish, between initial and intervocalic, but between the bilabial occlusive [b], used regularly for *B*, and a labio-dental [v] used regularly for *V*. The origin of the Zamboangueño [v] presents a nice problem which I discuss elsewhere. It exists no longer, of course, in standard Castilian.

In short, I have consistently corrected *B* to *V* wherever the *B* spelling was at variance with standard Spanish orthography.

The aspirate *H*. In sixteenth-century Castilian there existed an aspirate [h] in such words as *hazer* and *hablar*—in words, that is, where the initial *H* is derived from Latin *F* (not, of course, in words like *hombre* and *hora*). This aspirate [h] is still faithfully preserved in the Philippine contact vernaculars, as it is in parts of Spain and South America. The texts which I copy are all inconsistent, writing now '*ombre*' and '*aora*', now '*hay*' and '*hoy*', where an aspirate [h] could not possibly be intended. I have followed a well-worn Spanish convention in using a *J* to indicate the aspirate, while I write the mute *H* wherever it is customary in standard Spanish orthography. The genuine *jota*, the *J* of such words as *hijo*, is pronounced with no more force in the contact vernaculars than the aspirate [h]. A similar situation obtains wherever the aspirate has survived, and the Spanish reader is well accustomed to seeing '*ojo*' alongside '*jablar*' and reading the *J* in each case as no more than a strong aspirate.

***F* and *P*.** There is no labio-dental in Tagalog, and hence none in Ermitaño or Caviteño, where the voiceless bilabial occlusive [p] is regularly substituted for the labio-dental fricative [f]. *Filipinas* thus becomes *Pilipinas*. I have not attempted to restore the *F* of Spanish in the face of the complete consistency of both Balmori and Santos y Gómez on the point, and of the anomalous situation which exists in Zamboangueño.

In Zamboanga, perhaps because of Spanish contamination, perhaps because [f], by exception, exists in some of the southern dialects, one hears both [f] and [p] for Spanish [f]. Mr Saavedra's transcriptions have both *F* and *P*, and Mr Valera's reading of them (see the phonetic transcriptions) contain [f] and [p] *independently* of Mr Saavedra's orthography. I have, therefore, simply copied Mr Saavedra's spelling and transcribed Mr Valera's pronunciation as I received them. Even this does not adequately represent the complexity of the situation in Zamboanga, for one hears in addition the bilabial *F* [ɸ]. I fancy that this unusual sound is no more than the result of the confusion between [f] and [p].[2] There exists, apparently, a bilabial [ɸ] in Halmahera,[3] but it is too much to suppose that it may have descended to the Zamboangueño dialect via Ternate and the northern vernaculars. Inevitably there exist too the ultracorrections resulting from this confusion, and I have even heard '*Filifinas*'. There is, unfortunately, no example in our texts.

Intervocalic *D*. The fricative *D* [ð] which Spanish uses for *D* in an intervocalic position does not exist in Tagalog or the contact vernaculars. It is, in Spanish, particularly weak in the past participles ending in *-ado*, which in vulgar speech in Spain are commonly pronounced [aŭ]. The contact vernaculars were therefore faced with the choice of substituting a fully occlusive [d] for the fricative [ð] or of omitting the sound altogether.[4] No consistent solution was ever achieved, though the texts indicate a marked tendency to omit the *D* and spell '*-ao*' or '*-au*' for Spanish *-ado*. I have, perhaps arbitrarily, carried this tendency to its logical conclusion. It will be seen from the phonetic transcriptions that the fricative [ð] makes sporadic appearances, due indubitably to Spanish contamination; but the force of the occlusion in such words as end in *-ada*, where Spanish employs a slightly less tenuous fricative than in *-ado*, indicate the survival of the primitive sound-system, where no fricative was possible.

***L* and *R*.** The interchange of *L* and *R* occurs in a great many totally unrelated languages and may be accounted a general phonetic phenomenon. In Tagalog, however, except for a very few words, *r* occurs only as a variant of *d* or in foreign words. On the other hand many Spanish words containing *r* have been Tagalized with an *l*: Tagalog *sambalilo* for Spanish *sombrero*. In Spanish the interchange of *L* and *R* (*ar* for *al*, *mujel* for *mujer*) is essentially a vulgarism, and is typical of Andaluz speech only insofar as Andaluz has attracted to itself a great many of the vulgarisms of Spanish. The interchange is assisted by the very weak articulation of

[2] It might well be argued that such an 'explanation' is phonetically unsound, but I have no other.

[3] W. J. Entwistle, *Aspects of Language*, London, 1953, p. 330.

[4] I do not wish to imply that there was any conscious choice. From the beginning of the Ternateño dialect, and subsequently, whenever some new word was borrowed from Spanish, those accustomed to a Malayan sound-system would hear or fail to hear the fricative and imitate the word accordingly.

L and *R* in pre-consonantal and final positions in the south of Spain.[5] The interchange of *r* and *l* occurs in the contact vernaculars also, but is purely sporadic. There is no way of determining whether the Tagalog or the Mexican and Andaluz influence has been the more important. The texts are totally inconsistent, writing now '*mujel*' and now '*mujer*'. Nor do the readings of the text at all times agree with the orthography. I have again, therefore, followed my originals.

***NG*.** The sound [ŋ] does not exist in Spanish as a separate phoneme, but as a variant of [n] in such words as *banco* ['baŋko]. [ŋ] does, however, exist independently in Tagalog and the contact vernaculars, and I have rendered it in three different ways:

1. Tagalog *-NGK-* as in '*bangka*' I have represented by *-NC-*. The Spanish pronunciation of '*banca*' ['baŋka] is exactly the same as the Tagalog word.
2. I had no choice but to render Tagalog final *-NG* as *-NG*. Since neither the sound nor the spelling exists in standard Spanish, this does not seem to be an unwarranted departure from the principle of writing the contact vernaculars as though they were Spanish.
3. Tagalog medial *-NG-* I could not, however, deal with in the same way, for *-NG-* in Tagalog is [ŋ] while in Spanish it would be [ŋg]. I have therefore borrowed from Santos y Gómez the device of spelling this sound *-ÑG-*. It affects only two words, the Tagalog plural particle *mangá* and the emphatic *ngâ*, which, for Caviteño, I spell '*mañga*' and '*ñga*'. Balmori has '*mana*', but this represents exactly the adaptation of the word into Ermitaño, where it is pronounced ['mana].

Hispanization of Tagalog words. Tagalog words almost always suffer mutation in the contact vernaculars, showing frequent dislocation of the accent, as well as loss of the glottal stop, and so I have consistently hispanized Tagalog spellings. Despite the fact that this sometimes disguises the origin of the word I have preferred thus to accent the essential homogeneity of these languages, where words are not felt to be 'Tagalog' or 'Spanish' but simply 'Ermitaño' or 'Caviteño', and the etymology of all such words is adequately indicated in the notes.

There are only three instances in which my basically Spanish spelling diverges from Tagalog practice:[6] I accent according to Spanish rules (see below), treat Tagalog *-NG-* differently (see above), and write Tagalog *K* as *C*, since there is no example in our texts of a *K*'s occurring before a front vowel, except in Zamboangueño.

Raising of vowels. Tagalog has a basically trivocalic system (*a*, *i*, and *u*) so that in the contact vernaculars, and in Caviteño in particular, we sometimes find Spanish *e* and *o* raised to *i* and *u* respectively. This is effected consistently in only one instance, in the forms imitating the

[5] See Rafael Lapesa, *Historia de la Lengua Española*, revised edition, Madrid, 1950, p. 306–7.

[6] The Tagalog orthographic system is, of course, based on the Spanish, having been devised by Spanish priests in the first instance.

Tagalog intensitive such as *buenung-bueno*, *tempranung-temprano*. While writing the phonetic transcriptions I was continually faced with the problem of determining whether a sound would be better represented by [o] or [u], and, as occurred with other sounds too, there was little general agreement between the spelling of the original text and the sound of the recorded reading. I have adopted the arbitrary if consistent procedure of spelling each word affected in one way only, choosing the higher or lower vowel as the majority of spellings and pronunciations seemed to indicate. I might have chosen to follow standard Spanish orthography, but the consistent *cucí* [ku'si] (from Spanish *cocer*) of both text and speaker seemed to be too important a feature of Caviteño to ignore.

Accentuation. I have followed the accentuation-rules of standard Spanish in all but one instance: the final *-NG* of words like *buenung* must be classed with *-S* and *-N*. In other words, the accent in *buenung* falls on the first syllable. I have applied these rules to all Tagalog words, ignoring whether standard Tagalog orthographic practice demands a written accent or not.

There is only one inconsistency: the verbs of the contact vernaculars, with odd exceptions like *tiene* and *hay*, are all derived from the Spanish infinitive, so that the accent normally falls on the last syllable: *jablá*, *cucí*, etc. This accent is, however, often displaced onto the stem in conversation, but obeys no definite rules. I have, therefore, consistently marked the accent on all verbs as falling on the last syllable. In no case would this accentuation be unusual; and the odd displacement I have shown in the phonetic transcriptions.

CHAPTER III

ERMITAÑO: TEXT AND NOTES

Bibliographical Note—Text: *Na Maldito Arena*—Notes.

Bibliographical Note

The Ermitaño text which I here reprint, *Na Maldito Arena* (*Poema ermitense por Jesús Balmori*), appeared in *The Philippine Review* for April, 1917, pp. 71–73. It was preceded by a short critical note signed 'E.S.' (i.e. Epifanio de los Santos, perhaps the most distinguished of the Philippine Spanish literary critics) praising Balmori's talents as a writer and deploring the unjust neglect of the contact vernaculars.

Jesús Balmori, whose literary reputation rests on his Spanish poetry, was not the only writer to exploit the *caló ermitense* for literary purposes. The brothers Fernando and Manuel Guerrero, José Palma, Rafael Corpus, and Vicente Sotto all made use of it. Indeed Dr Manuel S. Guerrero has an entire collection of short-stories written in the Ermitaño dialect, entitled *Prosa Literaria*, but I was unable to see this work anywhere in Manila.

Balmori, under the pen-name of 'Batikuling', used to contribute a daily column in verse to *La Vanguardia*, now defunct, entitled '*Vida Manileña*', some of which employed Ermitaño.

The story *Na Maldito Arena* is clearly the work of a littérateur, and one might have wished for some folk-tale in guaranteedly popular Ermitaño. But I have been unable to find any such document surviving, and since modern speakers of Ermitaño use a language which in its pronunciation and its grammar is even more contaminated by contact with pure Spanish than the Ermitaño of Balmori (deducing his pronunciation from his spelling), it seemed better to print this piece of sophisticated simplicity, written in comparatively pure Ermitaño, with the warning that it is not typical of contact-vernacular literature, than to transcribe a genuine folk-tale in highly contaminated dialect.

There is the serious objection that this makes my treatment of these Philippine contact vernaculars an untidy mixture of the synchronic and the diachronic; but I think it is possible to defend this approach. It is impossible to write a linguistic history of the contact vernaculars, for we have no text or sample of them older than the end of the nineteenth century. And from the date at which we begin to see the contact vernaculars cultivated for literary and journalistic purposes they have been in decline. In this modern age, centralized government, the development of communications—roads, radio, and newspapers—and the very considerable movement of population within the Islands have sounded the death-knell of these politically unimportant tongues. After centuries of something which was by comparison stagnation, the contact vernaculars have changed and are changing very rapidly—acquiring new vocabulary from English' making much freer use of words and syntactical patterns from neighbouring native languages, and losing what uniformity of sound-system

and grammar they once possessed. The modern dialects are very clearly in a state of flux, and are not likely to recover from the impact of a changed society before they are extinct. In such circumstances, therefore, I have gone back to the earliest texts available: the Ermitaño text dates from 1917; the Caviteño texts date from 1924; while the Zamboangueño texts are contemporary, there being none older accessible, and their extreme inconsistency is perhaps sufficient justification for not using contemporary Ermitaño and Caviteño texts, and adequate illustration of the plight in which all the contact vernaculars now find themselves.

TEXT

Na Maldito Arena

Ta sumí el sol na pondo del mar.

Y el mar, callao el boca, ta jugá con su mana marejadas como un muchacha nerviosa con su mana pulseras.

El viento no más el que ta alborotá; el viento y el pecho de Pelisa, que ta lleno de sampaguitas na puera y ta lleno de suspiros na dentro. Y ele tan guapa, que ta comprará todo el gente con el Vilgen Santísima de Guía, que ta llená de plores y candelas na iglesia; ele tan peliz, que ta jablá el mana soltera, su mana compañera, como pájaro, no hay más vida sino volá y cantá, ta llorá agora, ta suspirá agora y ta clavá bueno el vista na 10 olas y na cielos.

Ya estremecé con ele un puelte voz.

— Pelisaaa.

Ya levantá de un tirada. El voz que ya soná como un trueno, ya volvé a soná.

— Pelisaaa. . . .

— Tay. . . .

— Dónde ba tallá tú, rayo?

— Aquí na junto del mana banca, tay.

Ya aparecé el viejo na detrás de ele y ya podé mirá el mana ojos de 20 ele, triste, como el talde que ta morí na un puelte aguacero de rosas.

Y ele ta hurtá el cara del mirada del viejo que ta examiná bueno con ele; pero no ya podé escondé el dolor.

— Ya llorá ba tú? Cómo ya llorá tú? Quién el que ya mandá llorá contigo? Visá pronto quién. . . .

Ya sonreí Pelisa.

— No hay, tay; cómo de llorá yo? Ya meté un granos de arena na mi ojos y ya jacé lagrimeá buenong-bueno con ilós. . . .

— Eh, ta podé pensá yo. . . .

Ya sentá na su junto, na mismo espalda del banca, boca abajo, y callao 30 ilós dos, ya volá el diperente pensamiento de ilós como dos pájaros.

Pelisa ta pensá na su desgracia, ta pensá con Andoy, el amor de ele de por vida que ya desaparecé un talde como éste; como éste no, polque agora como dorao y en aquél recio el baguio, na debajo del olas. . . . Cuatro el mes que ya pasá con éste y tres ya el mes con éste que ele ta sintí, na pondo de su vida, el vida de amor. . . .

Polque un vida el que ya dejá con ele; un vida que ya sentí ele palpitá na dentro de su cuelpo un noche claro de estrellas na pondo de un banca na maldito arena. . . .

Y el viejo ta pensá na su vida, peliz agora, masque el madre de Pelisa ya morí de viejo. No namás dos mil pesos el que ta gualdá ele na alcancía, dos mil pesos que ya conveltí en cualta todo el mana escamas de plata que ya calgá su rede na celca de quince años y que ele ta gualdá para cuando Pelisa de casá. . . . Pelisa! Sús María! Ta pijá bueno el viejo agora con ele, blanco como el mana espumas del mana olas, como un plor del olas; el ojos negro, redondo como lomboy; el labios presco, colorao 10 como macopas; y el pelo negro, como el noche que tá rompé el luna agora. . . .

— Viní ya, ya visá el viejo; ta sintí yo el relente na mis pies; ta apoderá na mis pielnas el diasque de reuma. . . .

Ya caminá ilós chiquitito, hasta ilós casa na junto mismo del playa. Agora el luna grande y redondo ta iluminá Ermita como parol. Y el mar ta reí callao siempre el boca, ta reí despacito, despacito. . . .

Cuando ya quedá acostao Pelisa, ya rezá ele puelteng-puelte con Dios nuestro Señor. . . .

— Señor, Señor Dios mío, no consentí vos con este pobre esclava de 20 vos el aprenta del vida ansina. Llevá vos conmigo, Señor; más ya suprí pol causa de mi culpa el que vos de ordená con mi alma que de suprí. . . .

Ya quedá ele dolmido aluego. Y ya soñá ele ansina.

Ele raw ta caminá na olas y el olas no ta sumí con ele.

— Dónde tú de andá, Pelisa? . . . ya gritá con ele su tata.

Y ele raw ya replicá:

— De salí ya yo con ustedes, tay, polque ese gente de allí con nisós masiao malo el boca, ta pretujá mi corazón como sípit de alimásag na su lengua, ta destrozá el nisós honra. . . .

Y ya agarrá su tay un bolo y ya pelseguí con todo ilós, con todo el 30 gente que si cosa-cosa el que ta visá. . . . Pero ele, Pelisa, ya proseguí su caminada sobre el olas, distante, distante, hasta que ya topá su cara na pondo del nubes que ta sostené el mar.

Y ya sentí ele na sus ojos un puelte resplandor; ya abrí ele bueno el ojos; ya despertá ele de un vez.

El sol que ta penetrá na ventana abierto ta empapá na su resplandor el entero pápag, petate, almohada, el pelo de ele como sábanas que ta envolvé su cuelpo, el pobre cuelpo desgraciao. . . .

Ya protá bueno el ojos; ya presigná aluego, y aluego el pobre ya podé recordá su sueños y ya saltá un lágrimas na su ojos. . . . 40

II

Ya tené el viejo un gran cuestión na playa pol causa del pescao que ta comprá por carretadas con un mujer.

Y ya salí todo el mana palabras gordo que ta gualdao na pondo del mal educación.

— Andá vos, ladrona; robá vos el cualta con vos nana. . . .

— Sí, na ñga; todo el gente ladrón cuando no ta vendé con usted barato; usted no más el santo. . . .

— Callá el boca, rayo! De platicá, platicá pa vos!

— Y agora con usted si yo ta platicá? Yo ba no hay boca para podé replicá con un viejo saragate como usted?

Ya agarrá el viejo un pescao grande y ya atizá un puelte golpe na cara del mujer.

— Cosa? Cosa el que ta jablá vos, grandísima. . . ? Ya mirá vos na mi casa ningún mujel que ta chispeá como vos con todo el mana gente? Repetí el que ya jablá vos, pa no pichí vos gañote. . . .

El mujel ya limpiá bueno el cara del sucio del pescao que ya sampegá con ele; pero no ya callá el boca; más purioso que un olas, ya troná:

— Preguntá usted con usted hija si quilaya de grande el suñgay que ya dejá na su testamento Andoy con usted. . . .

Simón ya sentí un puelte golpe na su cabeza, como rayo que ya estallá de un vez; ya sentí na su corazón como si ta saltá todo el mana pescao del playa; el ojos de ele ya ensangrentá; el labios de ele ya quedá blanco; el orejas de ele ya resoná un puelte ruido, como el que ta armá el oleaje cuando ta batí el rocas del espigón, y ya caé redondo na medio del playa.

Y el cabeza del pobre ya topá na borde de un banca y ya quedá empapao de sangre como un gumamelas que ta abrí el hojas na sol.

Na pondo del lancape donde ele ta morí, ya llamá Simón con su hija.

— Jablá tú conmigo todo el veldade, jablá tú si cosa el que ya succdé contigo. . . . Ya quedá ba tú desgraciada con Andoy?

Pelisa no ta replicá; ta llorá solamente despaciong-despacio, como ta llorá el mana estrella na altor cilestial. Y como ya escuchá el viejo el llantos que ta soná na sahig del lancape cuando ta caé el gotas, ya sentí todo el veldade, todo el grande desgracia de su vida, y no ya replicá!

El puelte piebre de Simón que no ta podé combatí el Doctor más que con cosa-cosa medicinas, ta subí agora altong-alto. Y ta delirá el viejo que ta caé un estrellas na olas y ya quedá el olas lleno de luz como un iglesia.

Media noche ya cuando Pelisa no ya podé reprimí el lágrimas delante de todo el gente que ta velá na casa con el viejo. Polque ele ta mirá que ta paltá el respiración con su tata, que ta quedá prío todo el cuelpo y que el boca de ele ta temblá como si de escupí ele su alma na cielos.

— Tay! . . . tay! . . . ya gritá como loco el impeliz. Pero el viejo Simón no ta escuchá más con ele; el viejo ya quedá muelto como un pájaro. . . .

Pelisa ya corré de rodillas na junto el pies del padre cura.

— Nacú, padre, nacú! . . .

Ya consolá con ele el cura; no saná ele armá-armá escándalo; cuando Dios ya sacá con su tata, seguro que ta necesitá con ele na otro vida. Callá el boca, Pelisa; rezá.

Pero ele no ta podé.

— No, padre! ya gritá; yo el que ya matá con tay; pol causa de mío ya morí ele; yo no ta podé rezá; yo no ta podé viví; ta sintí yo el impierno

na este vida y na otro vida. . . . Nacú, padre, nacú! . . . y no ta tené ya amor na mundo; el muerte no más, el muerte que ya matá con el amor! . . .

No hay quien ta replicá con ele sino el padre que ta consolá, ta consolá siempre:

— No, hija mía, no; ta quedá con vos un Dios; ta quedá con vos un vida joven, un vida nuevo. El mana dolor, ta pasá; todo, todo ta pasá na mundo; calmá vos nervios; secá vos ojos; alzá el vista con Dios nuestro Señor; rezá!

III

Ta morí el talde, dorao, rosas, azul, cuando ya retirá Pelisa na su casa.

Tres días ya el que ya volá desde aquél cuando ya enterrá con su tay.

Y agora ta pensá el pobre na su vida, desesperao, sin un luz, sin un sombra, sin un caridad de amor.

Tallí todo el casancapan tirao; todo el ropas tirao; todo el cualta que ya dejá con ele su tata tirao; ele sólo ta pensá agora que ele ta sobrá ya na este mundo, sin tay, sin amante, solo, solo. . . .

El campanas del iglesia ya soná uno, uno, ocho campanadas; aluego ya soná exequias; aluego ya quedá callao todo. . . .

Pelisa ya levantá de un tirada; ya apagá todo el luz y ya salí na playa.

El mar ta reí, ta reí puelteng-puelte, como un mujel que ta escuchá palabras de ventura. . . . Pelisa ya contemplá con ele, como con su nana, y ya gritá con ele desde el playa:

— Nay, jacé usted dormí conmigo, polque masiao puelte mi sueño!

Y ya caminá ele hacia el mar, como ya soñá ele un noche; ya caminá poco-poco, hundido na agua su pies, su rodillas, su cintura. . . .

Pero ya sentí ele prío de repente; prío na su cuelpo, prío na su vientre mojao, que ta besá el olas despacito. . . . Y ya recordá ele con su hijo, con el hijo de amor dormido na su entrañas. . . .

Y ya volvé de nuevo, ya volvé corriendo, gritando, espantao de ele mismo, el desgraciao. . . . El mar ta reí, ta reí siempre, y el playa, iluminao, ta esperá con ele humildemente.

Y cuando ele ya volvé a pisá el arena, aquel maldito arena de todo su mana amores, de todo su mana dolores, ya amá de nuevo el vida en el vida que ta estremecé na pondo de su entraña, como si ta cantá el ángel que ta dormido dentro de su carne:

— Gracias con vos, nay!

NOTES

In the notes which follow the reader will find continual references to the grammar of Tagalog. I have throughout made use of the admirable *A Manual of the Philippine National Language*, by Cecilio López, 3rd edition, Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1941. Most of my Tagalog examples have been taken from this work.

For the translation of Tagalog words occurring in the contact vernaculars I have made use of the following vocabularies and word-lists: *A National Language—English Vocabulary*, Manila: Institute of National Language, 1947; *A Pocket Dictionary Tagalog—English Vocabulary*, by

P. Jacobo Enríquez and María Odulio Guzmán, Manila, 1949; supplemented, for names of plants, by William H. Brown, *Useful Plants of the Philippines*, Ballarat (Australia): *Technical Bulletins* of the Philippine Department of Agriculture and Commerce, 1950, two volumes.

The first **bold face** figure refers to the page, the second to the line of the text.

24-00. na. I can find no entirely satisfactory derivation for this word, for, as it stands, it is neither Spanish nor Tagalog (at least in this function). It is an all-purpose preposition, supplanting Spanish *a*, *sobre*, *en*, etc., and it usurps in addition part of the function of the definite article. It corresponds, in fact, with the Portuguese contraction *no* and *na;* both are used in Indo-Portuguese, and it is probable that the word *is* Portuguese, adopted into Ternateño from the Portuguese trade-language. For other examples see Ch. VI, Grammar IA, 2, and VI, 17.

00. maldito arena. The adjective in Ermitaño is invariable. See Grammar III, 8.

01. ta<Sp. *está*. It is used in Ermitaño as an auxiliary verb to form the present tense.

01. ta sumí. Sp. *está sumiéndose* or *estaba sumiéndose*. Most verbs in Ermitaño (for exceptions see Grammar V, 13*b*) are formed by combining the auxiliary particles *ta*, *de*, and *ya* with the Spanish infinitive, minus the final *r*. This final *r* is often replaced in the contact vernaculars by the glottal stop, frequent in Tagalog as a final sound.

So *ta jugá* means 'I, you, he, we, they play'; *de jugá*, 'I, you, etc. will play'; *ya jugá*, 'I, you, etc. played'. These particles are indubitably derived from the Portuguese pidgin of the Eastern Seas, for Indo-Portuguese makes precisely similar use of the particles *ta*, *di*, and *ja*.

In Ermitaño what was originally a simple tense-system has become slightly more complex because of the psychological substratum of Tagalog —in this case, for instance, *ta sumí* may mean either 'is sinking' or 'was sinking'—but I reserve commentary on it for the notes in the appropriate places, and for the section on the grammar of the contact vernaculars, V, 14.

The reflexive construction is not used in Ermitaño. See Grammar V, 13*c*.

01. pondo. Sp. *fondo*. For the sound-system of Ermitaño and the orthographical conventions of the texts see pp. 19 and 103.

02. callao. Sp. *callado*. Although the surviving speakers of Ermitaño will sometimes pronounce a fricative [ð], it seems that this is the result of contamination of the sound-system of the primitive dialect by contact with correct Spanish. Normally the dialect makes a choice between a fully occlusive [d] and complete omission of the consonant. Ermitaño in general prefers the full occlusive, and will even reinforce it with an *e* when final, as in *rede* ['rεde], Sp. *red* [rεð]. It is, however, usually omitted in the past participle of Spanish *-ar* verbs, as it often is in Spain.

02. el boca. The definite article in Ermitaño is *el*, which replaces all the other Spanish forms: *la*, *los*, and *las*. See Grammar IA, 1.

24-02. su. The adjective in Ermitaño is invariable. The possessive adjective is, however, sometimes found in the Spanish plural form: *mis pies*, *mis ojos*, doubtless because these particular combinations are much more frequent than *mi pie* or *mi ojo*.

02. mana < Tagalog *mangá* [maŋ'a], usually abbreviated, in Tagalog, to *mga*. In Caviteño it is found in the form *mañga* ['maŋa], with dislocation of the accent. Here it is completely Hispanicized to ['mana].

In Tagalog the word is used together with the particle *ang* to convey the notion of plurality: *ang mga dalaga*, 'the girls'. Used without the article it means 'about', 'some': *mga anim na piso*, 'about six pesos'. This is one of the few grammatical devices taken from Tagalog into the contact vernaculars. See Grammar II, 6*b* and 6*c*.

02. un. Like the definite article, the indefinite article is invariable in Ermitaño. See Grammar IB, 3.

03. nerviosa. This is the Spanish feminine form of the adjective *nervioso*. The adjective is, however, invariable in Ermitaño. This *nerviosa* may be due to an oversight on the part of Balmori, a slip of the typesetter, or to the fact that, like *guapa*, which is found with the feminine termination in the Visayan dialects, the word is most often used in Spanish in the feminine form: the example given in the *Pequeño Larousse Ilustrado*, for instance, is '*una mujer nerviosa*'. I prefer the latter explanation.

04. el viento no más el que ta alborotá. The omission of the copula is one of the features of Ermitaño. It is probable that it is connected with a similar omission in Tagalog. The subject-predicate construction in Tagalog has two forms: one the normal order, S + *ay* + P, as in *Ang París ay magandá*, 'Paris is beautiful', and the other the inverted order, P + S, without the *ay* in between: *Magandá ang París*, 'Paris is beautiful' (literally 'Beautiful the Paris'), *Hindî mánananggol si Pedro*, 'Pedro is not a lawyer' (literally 'Not lawyer the Pedro'). The second form is the favourite sentence-construction in Tagalog. See also Leonard Bloomfield, *Language*, revised edition, London, 1935, Chapter 11, 'Sentence Types', especially p. 173.

The omission of a copula is characteristic, however, of so many languages, and of most other contact vernaculars (Chinook: *Haiás oliman okuk kanim*, 'That canoe is the oldest', literally 'Very old that canoe'; Pidgin: *He no goo*, 'That is no good'; Beach-la-Mar: *Kaikai he finish?* 'Is dinner ready?') that while one might in each case ascribe its omission to the influence of the substratum the explanation of its omission in the contact vernaculars is probably simply that it is an unnecessary grammatical device, and that it was dropped along with distinctions of number and gender. See Grammar V, 15.

04. no más. This phrase almost entirely replaces Spanish *sólo* and *solamente*, and Balmori sometimes writes it as one word. In Castilian the phrase occurs, but rarely, and we must look to the development of its use in America for the explanation of its frequency in Ermitaño. In America, it has acquired, besides the normal restrictive use (*a usted no*

más = *sólo a usted*, 'only to you') intensitive or emphatic uses: *allí no más* = *allí mismo*, 'right here, in that very place'; *hable no más*, 'just say the word', etc.

24-05. sampaguitas. The same word exists in Spanish, but it is almost certainly derived from the same source as the Ermitaño word, i.e. Tagalog *sampaga* + the Spanish diminutive suffix. It is a flower of the jasmine family, *Jasminum sambac* Alt. According to Professor López the origin of the word is ultimately Sanskrit.

05. na puera. Sp. *por fuera.* The use of the Ermitaño preposition *na* would seem to indicate a kind of substantivization of what in Spanish is an adverb. Parts of speech belong to the Indo-European languages, and in Beach-la-Mar and Pidgin (with Polynesian and Chinese substrata in place of Malay) we find the same readiness to confuse different parts of speech. For other examples see these notes, *passim*, and Grammar VI, 17.

05. ele. There is only one form of the third person singular personal pronoun in Ermitaño. Tagalog makes no distinction between 'he' and 'she' (nominative *siyá*, genitive *kanyá* or *niyá*). In Beach-la-Mar there is similarly no distinction: *he* or *him* (regardless of whether they stand in nominative or accusative positions) do duty for 'he', 'she', and 'it'. *He* in Pidgin stands for 'he', 'she' or 'it' just as *t'a*¹ (他) does in Chinese. In Mauricien *li* (< Fr. *lui*) stands for 'he' or 'she'. It is dangerous to draw conclusions about contact vernaculars from such a series of coincidences—in each case these identifications of Indo-European sex-distinctions are attributable to the influence of the substrata.

I may note here that the elimination of Spanish distinctions of gender would entail, in the first instance, a confusion over the use of *él* or *ella*, which might make of *ele* a sort of non-committal hybrid. But no other Spanish word is modified in this particular way in Ermitaño, i.e. *-a* is nowhere reduced to *-e* (supposing *ele*<*ella*) and no *-e* is ever added to final *-l* (supposing *ele*<*él*). These phonological difficulties make it almost certain that *ele* is the Portuguese *êle* or *ela*, each with relaxed final vowels, which have been entirely lost in modern Indo-Portuguese, and that this is one of the very few surviving features of Portuguese pidgin in the modern descendants of Ternateño.

05. y ele tan guapa. For the omission of the copula see note above and Grammar V, 15.

06. guapa. The word occurs in its Spanish feminine form since the use of this adjective with a masculine noun is very rare in Spanish. The word has been adopted into Visayan also.

06. Vílgen. Sp. *Virgen.* Preconsonantal and final *r* often become *l* in Ermitaño. See 'The Sound-system of the Contact Vernaculars', p. 105 and p. 20.

06. Santísima. The Spanish superlative of the adjective in *-ísimo* is not a living form in Ermitaño, and is used only in such traditional set phrases as this, where it has also kept its feminine form. See Grammar III, 8*b*.

24-06. el Vílgen Santísima de Guía. *Nuestra Señora de Guía*, patron saint of Ermita, is the patron of all sea-farers. Her feast-day is December 17th.

The miraculous discovery of the image is thus described in the *Anales de la Catedral de Manila:*

> Guiado por la Divina Providencia, el día 24 de junio del año 1571, un dichoso soldado del Adelantado Miguel López de Legazpi, andando a saco hacia la Marina, en medio de una mata de pandanes o palmillas, halló la milagrosa imagen de Nrta. Sra. de Guía, traída por ministerio de los Angeles a nuestro suelo, para refugio y amparo de las necesidades de sus naturales.

In 1591, as the result of a request made in 1586 by Domingo Salazar, first Bishop of the Philippines, to Pope Gregory XIV, the church of Ermita was granted a series of ecclesiastical privileges, while in 1758 the King of Spain, Fernando VI, declared her 'patrona jurada' of the city, 'a causa de los repetidos favores que le ha franqueado'. The image was presumably one left behind by an earlier expedition, perhaps Magellan's.

07. que ta llená. The text contains so many obvious misprints that I am not certain that this should not read '*que ta lleno*', following out the scheme of parallel repetitions which Balmori uses throughout the story. If it is indeed *que ta llená* the translation would be 'which people fill', or, since there is no reflexive in Ermitaño, and little distinction between transitive and intransitive, 'which is filled'.

07. plores. Sp. *flores.*

07. jablá. Sp. *hablar.* The initial *h* < Latin *f* lost its aspiration in Castilla la Vieja in the course of the fifteenth century, and a little later in Castilla la Nueva, though there are still a number of villages in Castilla la Nueva which pronounce it, as well as in Murcia, Jaén, Granada, and Almería. In Extremadura and the rest of Andalusia (excepting the provinces mentioned above, where the phenomenon is sporadic) the aspirate *h* is general in popular speech, while in the same region the *jota* (in Castilian [x]) is reduced to a similar aspiration. While there are cases of aspirate *h* in America, it is nowhere as strong as in Spain; it is in Mexico that it is most strongly conserved.

Note that *hablar* entirely replaces *decir* in Ermitaño, almost certainly on account of the regularity of its conjugation in Spanish. There are various other instances, e.g. *mirar* replacing *ver*, *andar* replacing *ir*, where a regular verb is preferred to an irregular one. Despite the fact that there is no conjugation in Ermitaño, this situation could only have come about if there were a period in which the natives struggled for a while with the complexities of irregular verbs, chose to use the regular verbs, and thereafter simplified the conjugation of the regular verbs. Otherwise it is as easy to say *decí* as *jablá*.

08. el mana soltera, su mana compañera. Translate, 'her friends, the other unmarried girls'. Note that the nouns take no plural inflection because of the plural particle *mana.* See Grammar II, 6*b*.

24-08. no hay más vida sino volá y cantá. The syntax of this sentence is peculiar, and *sino* cannot be used with *más* in standard Spanish; but the sense is clear.

09. agora. Sp. *agora*< Latin *hac hora* (cf. *ahora*< *ad horam*) is nowadays regularly substituted for *ahora* only in Chile, and in Spain in the area which formerly spoke Leonese, that is, in León and Salamanca. It is an archaism in Castilian, and, like many other archaisms, has been extensively conserved in South America, in most areas alongside *ahora*.

It is also, of course, Portuguese, and is used in the same form in Indo-Portuguese. It is, therefore, impossible to determine whether the *agora* of the Philippine contact vernaculars is a Spanish archaism, preserved from the early seventeenth century, an Americanism, borrowed from American troops, or a survival of the Portuguese pidgin on which Ternateño was based.

09. bueno. Castilian would use the adverb *bien*. With a few rare exceptions (see Grammar III, 9*b*), Ermitaño regularly uses the Spanish adjectival forms with adverbial force. In Tagalog the distinction between 'adjective' and 'adverb' is, of course, virtually meaningless. We find the same in Beach-la-Mar: *You watch me good*, and in Pidgin, where the explanation of the confusion lies again in the substratum which fails to distinguish between adjectives and adverbs.

10. cielos. There is, perhaps, no special peculiarity about the use of *cielos*, instead of the more usual Spanish *cielo*, in this context. But Ermitaño shows a certain preference for plural nouns, and the regular substitution of *cielos* for *cielo* is one aspect of the phenomenon which I discuss in more detail in Grammar II, 7.

11. ya estremecé. *Ya* is Spanish *ya*< Latin *iam*, 'already', 'now', which is used in Ermitaño as a kind of auxiliary to form the past tense. It indicates at the same time a perfective aspect. Indo-Portuguese uses *já* in precisely the same way.

11. estremecé. In Spanish, *estremecer* has the meaning 'to cause to tremble', as here, as well as the much more frequent 'to tremble'. But in any case Ermitaño often uses transitive verbs intransitively and *vice versa*. See Grammar V, 13*c*.

11. con ele. This is the usual form of the personal accusative in Ermitaño. *Conmigo*, *contigo*, *con ele*, etc. are regularly substituted for the indirect Spanish *me*, *te*, *le*, as well as the emphatic *a mí*, *a ti*, *a él*, etc. *A* has disappeared completely from the Ermitaño lexicon, but it is not at all clear why it should have been supplanted by *con*.

11. puelte. Sp. *fuerte*. The phonetics of these substitutions are fully dealt with in 'The Sound-system of the Contact Vernaculars' pp. 103 and 105.

13. de un tirada. More usual in Castilian is *de un tirón*. There is, however, no other special peculiarity about the existence of the phrase in Ermitaño. We may note, however, that only the first of these phrases is used in Portuguese and Indo-Portuguese.

24-16. tay. Tagalog *tay*, a shortened affectionate form of *tatay*, variant *tatang*, 'Daddy'.

17. ba. Tagalog *ba*. In Tagalog the particle *ba* (or, in its full form, *bagá*) was formerly used only with questions requiring 'yes' or 'no' for an answer, and was placed after the predicate in an affirmative question, after the negative particle in a negative one; in modern Tagalog, however, *ba* is used for all types of question, and as a dubitative particle. In Ermitaño it is a question-indicator and in most instances immediately follows the interrogative adverb. See Grammar V, 16.

17. tallá. Sp. *está allá*. This is a curious re-establishment of a distinction between the two senses of the verb 'to be', differentiated in Castilian by the use of *ser* and *estar*, the one the normal copula indicating permanent state, the other indicating position or temporary state. The verb *ser* is not used at all in Ermitaño, being replaced (where it is not omitted altogether) by *ta*< Sp. *estar*. Ermitaño, then, faced with the problem of recapturing the full force of *estar* has resorted to two compounds, *talli*< Sp. *está allí* and *tallá*< Sp. *está allá*, which, by a further curious semantic twist signify 'to be here' and 'to be there'. (In Spanish 'here' is *aquí*, while *allí* means 'there' and *allá* means 'thither'). Translate simply 'Where are you?' See Grammar V, 15*b*.

17. rayo. The use of *rayo* in Spanish in a figurative sense to indicate a lively or intelligent person is not unusual, but the word here has an affective sense, corresponding to the Spanish *luz*. There is, perhaps, no great gap between *rayo* and *luz*, but this further semantic variant is strictly an Ermitaño development.

18. na junto de. Sp. *junto a* (more commonly *cerca de*). See note above on *na puera* 24.05 and Grammar VI, 17*b*.

18. banca. Tagalog *bangkâ*, a generic term for all kinds of boats and canoes. Balmori writes *banka*, a compromise between the Spanish and the Tagalog spellings; but the word has been thoroughly Hispanicized in Ermitaño, since in Tagalog the accent falls on the last syllable, and the final sound is a glottal stop (though it is true that Balmori had no way of representing the glottal stop). The circumflex accent in Tagalog is a compound of the acute accent, which indicates the accentuation of the syllable, and the grave accent, which indicates a following glottal stop.

18. na junto del mana banca. 'Beside the boats'. Again, with the plural particle *mana*, the substantive is not inflected to show the plural.

19. na detrás de. See note on *na puera* 24.05

19. el mana ojos. Note that the substantive has a plural form even though *mana* is employed. I suspect, however, that *ojos* has no singular form. When Pelisa has a grain of sand in her eye (see below) she says she has '*un granos de arena na mi ojos*'. The situation is obscured by the peculiar *un granos*, but *mi ojos* (cf. *mis pies*, *mis ojos*, elsewhere) lends

some support to this suggestion. One rarely has occasion to talk about one eye, and the frequency of the form *ojos* may have given occasion for a singular *ojos* (supported by analogy, it may be, with *Dios*, *Carlos*, and the like). *Un granos*, in fact, may be in exactly the same case. In Tagalog many nouns representing pairs in Spanish are adopted with *-s* even if one of the pair is meant: e.g. *sapatos*, 'shoe', *sinelas*, 'slipper'. In short this may be only an apparent exception to the rule that the substantive does not take a plural inflection when preceded by *mana*. My informants in Manila were unable to give a concrete ruling on the point.

24-19. de ele. This is the most usual way of indicating a possessive in Ermitaño. See Grammar IV, 12*b*.

20. na un puelte aguacero. The preposition *na*, while usurping part of the function of the *definite* article, as in *na pondo del mar*, never causes omission of the *indefinite* article.

22. no ya podé. The position of the negative, which in Spanish immediately precedes the verb, shows how intimately the particle *ya* has come to be regarded as part of the verb.

23. ya llorá ba tú. *Ba* is the interrogative particle.

23. quién el que. This tautology, impossible in Spanish without a copula, and then regarded as a Gallicism, is frequent in Ermitaño.

23. mandá llorá. *Mandar*, in Spanish, has the sense of 'to order' (as well as other less relevant meanings). There is here a slight semantic change to 'cause'. Or it may be that the word has survived from Portuguese pidgin where, as in Portuguese, it does also mean 'to cause'.

24. contigo. See note on *con ele*, 24.11

23. quién el que ya mandá llorá contigo? Translate, 'Who has made you weep?'

24. visá. Sp. *avisar*, 'to inform', requires a personal dative. The Academy Dictionary does not admit of an intransitive use, and here the use of an accusative *quien* involves a semantic shift, dependent on the word's becoming a transitive verb.

Note the form of the imperative in Ermitaño. See Grammar V, 14.

26. no hay. This phrase, often pronounced [nŭaĭ], with the characteristic Tagalog *nu* for *no* (which one hears when Tagalogs speak English also) has developed in Ermitaño idiomatic nuances over and above the normal sense of 'there is not', nuances which correspond more with the Spanish *no hay de qué*, *no importa*, etc., 'it doesn't matter', 'it is nothing'.

26. cómo de llorá yo? 'Why should I weep?'

For a full discussion of the problem of tense and aspect in the contact vernaculars see Grammar V, 14.

The origin of this Ermitaño future tense or unreal aspect must lie in the Spanish (or Portuguese) *haber de llorar*. This new analytical future

is extremely interesting, paralleling as it does the change from the synthetic Latin *cantabo* to the Vulgar Latin (and later Romance languages') *cantare habeo*, 'I have to sing', therefore 'I shall sing'. In Spanish *cantar hé* had been completely synthesized to *cantaré* by the middle of the seventeenth century, precluding the possibility of such constructions as *cantar lo hé*, still possible in Portuguese.

Spanish *haber de cantar* indicated originally obligation, 'I have to sing', but its force has gradually been weakened, and it now has little more force than the *must* of English 'I must go', or the aspect of probability. In Castilian, however, it does not indicate simple futurity as it does in Portuguese. In Spanish South America the form with *haber* has come to have no more than future force, and, together with other periphrases, has replaced the simple future in a great many instances.

It is possible, therefore, that this Ermitaño *de* may be the result of American influence, or simply a parallel local development. But it is more likely that it is simply the adoption of the Indo-Portuguese *di*, derived from a periphrastic Portuguese future. In any case it is interesting to note that *Cómo de llorá yo?* is exactly translated in Spanish by *Cómo habia de llorar yo?*

24-26. meté. Sp. *meter*, 'put'. The Spanish verb would indicate deliberate intention, unless it occurred in such a construction as *ya se me metió*, which is not possible in Ermitaño since it has no reflexive. The semantic change would then depend simply on the elimination of the reflexive. See Grammar V, 13*c*.

26. un granos. See the note above on *el mana ojos* 24.19. I discuss the question in detail in Grammar II, 7. Translate, 'a grain of sand'.

27. buenong-bueno. Spanish *muy*, 'very', has been entirely replaced in all the contact vernaculars by this Tagalog device and the use of *masiao* < Sp. *demasiado* (see Grammar III, 10*c*). Although there are various ways of expressing excessiveness in Tagalog, Ermitaño has chosen only one, the repetition of the word-base of the adjective with a connective.

If one wished to say in Tagalog 'Our house is very beautiful', one would say *Ang aming bahay ay magandang-magandá* (literally, 'The our house beautiful-*ng*-beautiful'), the form with the connective which has been imitated in Ermitaño. But 'Pedro's illness is very serious' would be rendered by *Mabigát na mabigát ang sákit ni Pedro* (literally, 'Serious *na* serious the illness of Pedro'), with a different connective, because of the consonantal ending of the adjective. See Grammar III, 10*b*.

It is perhaps unnecessary to add that there are no adverbs in Tagalog, where adverbial concepts are conveyed by a battery of particles, and that the explanation above is in no way invalidated by the fact that in Spanish syntax *bueno* would have to be explained as an adverb.

27. con ilós. It will be seen that the direct impersonal accusative is treated in Ermitaño in the same way as the personal accusative—that is that the Spanish distinction has been lost.

All Tagalog sentences are built round the copula *ay* or *'y*, which corresponds roughly with our copulative 'to be', so that 'The governor went

to Manila' becomes 'The governor is gone to Manila', *Ang guberndór ay naparoón sa Maynilá;* and 'I gave the book to Pedro' becomes 'The book was given by me to Pedro', *Ang aklát ay ibinigáy ko kay Pedro.* (There are also more complex means: 'Why did you hurt your friend?' becomes 'Why your hurting the friend your?', *Bakit mo sinaktán ang kasama mo?*). The result of this system is that there is no such thing as the direct accusative of a verb. Although we do have in Ermitaño constructions with a direct object when that is a substantive (*Ya podé mirá el mana ojos de ele*) we may suspect that the refusal of Ermitaño to accept a direct pronominal accusative has something to do with the Tagalog substratum, in which all objects are indirect.

24-27. ilós. Sp. *ellos.* The dislocation of the accent, though forms like *ilós* appeared in Spanish in the Middle Ages (whence the unemphatic form *los*), is almost certainly due to Tagalog influence, where borrowed words with medial consonant clusters are accented on the last syllable: Sp. *carne* > Tag. *karné,* Sp. *María* > Tag. *Maryá,* Sp. *bolsa* > Tag. *bulsá,* etc.). Similarly the reduction of *ll* [ʎ] to *l* has parallels in Tagalog borrowings from Spanish: Sp. *Castilla* > Tag. *kastilà.* The influence of Tagalog phonetics on the sound-system of Ermitaño is discussed pp. 109 foll.

28. ta podé pensá yo. 'I thought'. Spanish would have *pensaba.* Since the only way of indicating past tense in Ermitaño is by the use of the particle *ya,* which still retains its Spanish perfective force of completed action, the only way of indicating imperfect action is by means of *ta.* We find, therefore, a mixture of tense-forms in Ermitaño, when the force of the particles *ta* and *ya,* as a present and a past auxiliary, and as a continuous and a perfective particle, become confused. The opening sentence, *Ta sumí el sol na pondo del mar,* is probably best translated by 'The sun was sinking . . .' since Ermitaño has no way of distinguishing between 'is sinking' and 'was sinking'. *Ya sumí el sol* could only be 'the sun sank' or 'the sun has sunk'. See Grammar V, 14.

Podé, Sp. *poder,* 'to be able', is best translated in this context by rendering the whole phrase: 'I could have sworn. . . .'

29. na su junto. Here again we have a kind of substantivization of the preposition, as in the other compound prepositions with *na: na detrás de, na dentro de,* etc., this time even more clearly indicated by the use of the possessive adjective. And here too we may suspect that the explanation lies in Tagalog syntax habits, where the preposition *par excellence* is *sa,* in combination with the word denoting the direction or the location. So: *sa tapát,* 'in front of'; *sa loób,* 'inside'; *sa labás,* 'outside'; *sa itaás,* 'above'; *sa ibabâ,* 'below'; *sa haráp,* 'in front of'; *sa ilalim,* 'underneath'; *sa siping,* 'by the side of'; *sa tabí,* 'near'; *sa piling,* 'together'. The words used with *sa* to form these prepositions are almost all capable of being used as nouns (*ibabâ,* 'lower part'; *haráp,* 'front', 'façade'; *tabí,* 'edge', 'border'; *piling* 'side'; and so on). It seems as though this practice has been imitated in Ermitaño, thus substantivizing the Spanish prepositions and admitting of their use with a possessive adjective.

24-29. espalda. In Spanish 'back'. It is used in standard Castilian for a human back, less frequently of animals, and rarely of the back of a building. I know of no example of the word's being applied to the bottom of a boat. See the section on contact-vernacular vocabulary, pp. 111 foll.

29. boca abajo. This phrase, though common in Spanish with the sense of 'face down', would scarcely be applicable to an upturned boat. See the preceding note.

29. callao ilós dos. This absolute construction is frequent in Ermitaño. See Grammar V, 15.

30. ilós dos. Spanish would use not the pronoun but the article in this instance, and would say *los dos,* which we should expect to be in Ermitaño *el dos.* Perhaps the construction has arisen by analogy with *estos dos, aquellos dos,* where the demonstrative adjective has the same form as the pronoun. Or again it may have some connection (always provided that it is not a spontaneous development) with the Tagalog practice of never using a cardinal number as the subject of a sentence without the support of a noun or pronoun.

30. el diperente pensamiento de ilós. Spanish would demand a distibutive.

30. como dos pájaros. This simile, which we have met before, and shall meet again, is indicative, not of the poverty of Balmori's imagination, but of the limitation of the vocabulary of Ermitaño, where anything which sings, or flies, or seems happy, is described as being 'like a bird'. It is simply a reflection of colloquial practice.

31. ta pensá na . . . ta pensá con. . . . Sp. *pensar en,* 'to think of', is used indifferently for things and people. This is an indication of the way in which Ermitaño has acquired for itself a grammatical system with its own rules and practices.

32. de por vida. This ellipsis is not permissible in Spanish, though the meaning would be quite obvious to a Spaniard.

32. como éste no. Note the omission of copulas throughout this sentence. Grammar V, 15.

32. polque. Sp. *porque.*

33. como dorao. This is not a simile, 'as though gilded', for *dorado* has lost in Ermitaño all its primitive significance and means merely 'golden'. The *como* is a kind of apology for an exaggeration.

33. recio el baguio. In Tagalog, when the normal word order of a simple sentence is reversed, the copula *ay* is omitted. So *Si Pedro ay matalino* (literally, 'The Pedro is intelligent') becomes, with inversion, *Matalino si Pedro* (literally, 'Intelligent the Pedro'). This construction in Ermitaño may be connected with the Tagalog practice, or may be an independent development.

24-33. baguio. Tagalog *bagyó.* The word is used in Spanish only with the sense of 'a typhoon in the Philippines', and, indeed, though it is admitted into the Academy Dictionary, its use seems to be confined to the Spanish of Manila.

34. cuatro el mes. Cf. *recio el baguio* 24.33

34. tres ya el mes. *Ya* here, though it is still perhaps an auxiliary indicating completed action, retains some of its Spanish adverbial force, as is evident from its position in the sentence.

34. tres ya el mes . . . el vida de amor. The syntax of this sentence is somewhat confused. Translate, 'And three months had gone by since she first felt, deep within her, a new life born of her love'. *El vida de amor* seems to be in apposition to *éste.*

35. ta sintí. Though this form is usually to be explained as a present tense, the particle *ta* has here simply the force of continuous action: 'has been feeling'.

25.01. ya sentí ele palpitá. *Palpitá* occurs here exactly as we should expect *palpitar*, the infinitive, to occur in Spanish. Though the terminology is perhaps irrelevant when speaking of a contact vernacular, we see that in Ermitaño infinitive, imperative, and the significant element used in forming finite verbs, have all same form.

04. masque. On the face of it, the translation of this phrase would seem to be a rather cynical, 'Moreso now, since Pelisa's mother died', taking *más* to be the Spanish *más*, 'more'. However it is more probable that *mas* is Spanish—and Portuguese—*mas*, 'but,' so that the phrase might be literally rendered into English 'but that'. The sense of *masque* would then cover 'although', 'in spite of the fact that', and any concessive notion. *Masque* as a concessive does not exist in Spanish; but it might very easily have been formed under the influence of Tagalog *maskí*, 'even if', if, indeed, *masque* is not a Hispanicized *maskí.*

05. namás. One is reminded of Sp. *nada más*, often pronounced in hasty or vulgar speech as [naa'mas]. But this leads us into difficulties, since the translation of *no namás* is 'no less than'. It is conceivable that the *na* is the Tagalog *na*, 'already', but this would give us 'no more than' instead of 'no less than'. Perhaps *no nada más que* = *algo más que*, 'rather more than'; in which case *na* would be a contraction of *nada.*

05. alcancía. Sp. *alcancía*, a kind of money-box, but the translation of *na alcancía* is no more than a general 'saved up'. The word also exists in Tagalog as *arkansiyá*, 'money-box'.

06. dos mil pesos . . . todo el mana escamas. The sense and syntax of this sentence are clear if we take *que* to be the typical Spanish ellipsis for *porque.* This interpretation is confirmed by the fact that the usual relative in Ermitaño is *el que.* However, bearing in mind the punctuation of the sentence I am not convinced that this is the correct analysis, and I suspect that it may be an example of mixed construction: *dos mil pesos en el que ya convelti todo el mana escamas* and *ya convelti en cualta. . . .*

25-06. cualta. Sp. *cuarto*, usually in the plural, 'money'. A *cuarto* is an old Spanish coin, made of silver and copper, worth 0.3 of a peseta. The word is now used only in the plural: *no tener cuartos*, 'to have no money', and is colloquial.

06. el mana escamas de plata. 'The fish'. This synechdoche (Sp. *escama* means 'scale') would be startling in Castilian. In Ermitaño it is little more than a synonym for *pescado.* The correct Spanish *pez* is not used at all. This phrase is typical of a feature of contact vernaculars which I discuss in detail pp. 111, 114. See also the note on *espalda,* 24.29.

07. calgá. Sp. *cargar* in the sense of 'to weigh down'.

07. rede. Sp. *red.* The final Spanish fricative [ð] is never used in Ermitaño, where it either disappears or becomes fully occlusive. In Tagalog a final *d* is usually implosive and only slightly voiced, and the Tagalog sound could not therefore be substituted for the fricative. The occlusive [d] is therefore assisted by an [e]. See 'The Sound-system of the Contact Vernaculars', pp. 102 foll.

07. na celca de. Sp. *cerca de.* If we do not need to suppose that *na* here also includes a definite article, but corresponds exactly with Spanish *en*, we may translate 'in almost fifteen years'. But if *celca* is, in fact, substantivized, we must suppose a slight semantic change and translate 'in the course of'.

07. ta gualdá. *Ta* indicates progressive aspect: 'has (or had) been saving up'.

07. para cuando Pelisa de casá. The particle *de* here renders what in Spanish would be a subjunctive: either (depending on whether *ta gualdá* indicates past or pluperfect) *que había estado guardando para cuando Pelisa se casara* or *que ha estado guardando para cuando Pelisa se case.* One might also say: *para cuando Pelisa se hubiera de casar.* The *de* of Ermitaño indicates no more than an intention, a futurity which may be either present or past.

08. de casá. Spanish would employ a reflexive, *casarse*, a form which has entirely disappeared in Ermitaño. See Grammar V, 13*c*.

08. Sús María. Sp. *Jesús María.*

08. ta pijá . . . con ele. Sp. *fijarse en*, 'pay close attention to'.

10. lomboy. Tagalog *lumbóy*, a species of blackberry, *Eugenia jambolana* Lam., also known as *duhat.*

11. macopas. The word is neither Tagalog, Spanish nor Portuguese. I have no explanation of it.

13. viní ya. It will be seen that *ya* is here used in its Spanish adverbial sense, and is not a particle of completed action.

25-13. el relente. Sp. *relente*, the dampness felt in the air on a clear night. I comment in more detail elsewhere (pp. 113 foll.) on the curious selection of words which have been retained by the contact vernaculars, which have by no means confined their selection of vocabulary to either the most common or the most necessary words.

13. mis pies. For the pluralization of the possessive adjective see Grammar III, 8*c*.

14. el diasque. The word as it stands is neither Spanish or Tagalog. But one is reminded of Sp. *diantre*, 'devil', taken into Tagalog as *diantres*.

15. chiquitito. In Spanish there is no adverb derived from the adjective *chico* (as there is none in English from the adjective *small*). The adverbial use of the word in Ermitaño involves, therefore, some semantic change, perhaps 'with short steps' or simply 'slowly'.

The use of an adverbialized adjective is not uncommon in South America: *nos íbamos suavecito, los hombres iban lento*, etc. See Rafael Lapesa, *Historia de la Lengua Española*, Madrid, 1950, p. 334.

15. ilós casa. *Ilós* is here a possessive. See Grammar IV, 12.

15. na junto mismo del playa. Here *na* clearly substantivizes the Spanish preposition *junto de* (or the adjective *junto*), since otherwise it could not be qualified by *mismo*. Again there is a slight semantic change: 'On the very edge of the beach'.

17. despacito. The diminutive, in Spanish, indicates in this case something a little more rapid than *despacio*. There is no satisfactory English translation.

18. puelteng-puelte. Sp. *fuerte*. The adjective is used for the adverb, and is subjected to a Tagalog device of intensification. See note on *buenong-bueno* 24.27, and Grammar III, 10.

18. Dios nuestro Señor. The usual first person plural possessive in Ermitaño is *nisós*. *Nuestro* has survived as part of an often-used formula; it is not a living form.

20. Señor Dios mío. See preceding note, and Grammar IV, 12.

20. no consentí. Note that the negative imperative shows the same invariable form of the verb.

20. vos. For a full discussion of the forms of the second person in Ermitaño see Grammar IV, 11*b*.

21. ansina. Old Spanish *ansí* or *ansina* (Modern Spanish *así*) is still current in America.

22. más ya suprí . . . que de suprí. Here there is clearly considerable contamination by contact with correct Spanish. Contact-vernacular syntax is not normally capable of handling such complicated ideas as this—at least in this way. Translate, 'Already I have suffered more on account of my mistake than you can ever condemn my soul to suffer'. The comparative use of *el que* cannot be regarded as typical Ermitaño usage.

25-22. pol causa de. Sp. *a causa de*. The weak *a*—never used in Ermitaño except as a linking particle between two verbs: *volvé a soná*—is replaced by *por*.

22. de ordená. Again the form with *de* does duty for a Spanish subjunctive. The clause might be rendered in Spanish: *lo que Tú hubieras de ordenar que sufriera mi alma*. See Grammar V, 14.

22. de suprí. See preceding note.

23. aluego. Sp. *luego*.

24. raw. I have failed to Hispanicize to *rao* this Tagalog word (cf. Sp. *Mindanao*, Tag. *Mindanáw*, etc.). The only dictionary which gives this word explains it: 'see *daw*, adverb, it is said'. I find some examples of its use in Cecilio López, *op*, *cit*., p. 304, with the translations, 'Don't you play there, *someone says* (*it is said*)', '*According to him* (*someone says, it is said*), his carabao got lost', and '*According to them* (*they say*) their chief refuses'. It is difficult to see what the intention of *raw* in *ele raw ta caminá na olas* can be, for an 'it is said' or 'they say' seems quite irrelevant.

24. el olas no ta sumí con ele. *Sumí* may here be used in the sense of the Spanish transitive *sumir*, 'to submerge', 'to drown'; but it is more probable that it stands for the Spanish reflexive *sumirse*, 'to sink', when *con* would be, not merely the sign of the personal accusative, but a full significant, as in Spanish, 'with'.

25. dónde tú de andá? 'Where are you going?' which would be rendered in Spanish by a present tense (*¿Adónde vas?*), as in English, is given in Ermitaño the particle of futurity, *de*.

25. tata. Tagalog *tata* (cf. note on *tay*, 24.16), showing the reduplicated diminutive typical of child speech, 'Daddy'. Compare *nana* and *nay*, 'mother'.

27. de salí ya. This is an interesting form, indicating as it does future and perfective action at the same time. The use of this perfective *ya* would not be startling in Caviteño; but it is only rarely used as an adverb in Ermitaño.

27. ese gente de allí. *Ese*, rather than *este* or *aquel*, may be indicative of South American influence.

28. masiao. Sp. *demasiado*, 'too much'. The inability to distinguish between a superlative and the idea of excess is common both to Tagalog and all other contact vernaculars.

It corresponds with the second method of intensification of the adjective in Tagalog (see 24.27 on *buenong-bueno* and Grammar III, 10). Tagalog uses the prefix *napaka-*, so that *Napakaalat nitóng ating ulam* (literally, 'Too salty this our food') means either 'Our food is too salty' or 'Our food is very salty'. In the same way words like *labis*, 'excess'; *sakdál*, 'extremely'; *hari*, 'king'; *ulo*, 'head'; *ubod*, 'centre'; *higit*, 'surpass', etc., may be used to express intensification, without making any distinction between 'too much' and 'very'.

The English contact vernaculars show the same confusion. Pidgin uses 'too much', which becomes *too muchee* [tuˈmatʃi], as well as *very* (usually transcribed with an *l*) but the distinction between the two is not clearly observed, and *too muchee* or *too* is regularly employed in a purely intensitive sense. In Beach-la-Mar *too* means 'very' and *too much* means 'very much'. Hugo Schuchardt explains this (*Die Sprache der Saramakkaneger in Surinam*, Amsterdam, 1914) by supposing that in his dealings with the native the Englishman would exaggerate, and would say 'You are too lazy' instead of 'You are very lazy' (he is referring to the *tumussi* < *too much* of the Surinam vernaculars), and that the native has simply imitated this usage.

Otto Jespersen, in his chapter on 'Pidgin and its Congeners' in *Language: Its Nature, Development, and Origin*, London, 1922, p. 225, takes up this notion, and argues that the fact that *too* is used for 'very' in Beach-la-Mar and Pidgin, as well as in the Negro-English of Surinam, and that a similar confusion is found in the speech of small children, indicate that these contact vernaculars are no more than English badly learned. It seems to me that it would be more instructive to see if there might not be some other reason for the failure to distinguish between these two ideas—to look, in other words, at the substrata which Jespersen persistently scorns.

William Churchill, *Beach-la-Mar, the Jargon or Trade-Speech of the Western Pacific*, Washington: The Carnegie Institute, 1911, p. 27, notes that the islanders do not think comparatively, and in their own languages 'lack the form of words by which comparison may be indicated': they can say only, 'This big, that small'. This is surely connected with their inability to distinguish, *in their own language*, between a superlative and the notion of excess, and therefore with their failure to distinguish between the two in English. It is indisputable that *he savvy too much* in Beach-la-Mar is no more than 'he knows a great deal'. According to Churchill's vocabulary of Beach-la-Mar, p. 52, *very* occurs most often in the phrase *very good*, and is best expressed in other contexts by *plenty* or *too much*.

Jespersen, however, ignores all this first-hand evidence and supports Schuchardt's explanation, dismissing the importance of the substratum in the consideration of any contact vernacular. But I cannot accept that the use of *masiao* in Ermitaño has no connection with the Tagalog practice, or that *too much* is unconnected with the habits of thought conditioned by the Polynesian and Chinese languages in Beach-la-Mar and Pidgin, or even that the *tumussi* of Dutch Guiana (though I have no further information on these languages) is entirely unconnected with the psychology of the languages of the substratum, whatever that may be.

I have seen it affirmed that the *too muchee* of Pidgin cannot be attributed to the Chinese substratum since Chinese does distinguish between 'too' and 'very'. But this statement is not exact. There does indeed exist a common Chinese word for 'very', *hên*³ (很), which means 'very' and only 'very'. This is indubitably the reason why Pidgin-speakers never make mistakes in using the English word *very*. But there exist also two other characters, both pronounced *t'ai*⁴, 太 and 泰, the first of which means

'too', 'too much', 'exceedingly' or 'very great', while the second means only 'very great'. The first is used in such compounds as *T'ai*⁴ *p'ing*² *yang*² (太平洋), 'Pacific Ocean' (literally, a translation from the English, 'Great Peace Ocean' or 'Great Peaceful Sea'), in which *t'ai* cannot possibly have any connotations of 'too much'. There are numerous other instances in which *t'ai*—the usual word for 'too'—means merely 'very'. I have personally known of cases where Europeans have spent a good deal of time trying to explain to their servants the difference between 'too' and 'very', largely without success. This situation could not exist, as the confusion in Pidgin could not exist, if there were not the same confusion in Chinese.

25-28. malo el boca. Spanish would prefer to use the analogous phrase *mala lengua.*

28. pretujá. I am unsure of the etymology of this word. It has, presumably, some connection with *apretar.* There is ample precedent for the elision of the prefix (*demasiado* > *masiao; avisar* > *visá; está* > *ta*, etc.), and the Spanish augmentative suffix *-ujo* presents no great difficulty. But it is unusual to find a Spanish suffix as a living form in a contact vernacular, and I am inclined to assume a Spanish **apretujar* as the original form, that is to say, that the word was taken over with suffix attached.

28. sípit. Tagalog *sipit*, pincers of a crab.

28. alimásag. Tagalog *alimasag*, a species of crab, *Neptunus gladiator* Fabr.

28. como sípit de alimásag na su lengua. While the sense of this phrase is clear enough, the syntax is odd: 'as if there were crabs' pincers on their tongues', with omission of the verb, as is usual in Ermitaño. If it were 'They wring my heart with their tongues like crabs' pincers' there is difficulty in the translation of *na;* but in any case we must not pay too much attention to complexities of syntax in contact vernaculars, but be satisfied if the mere juxtaposition of significants produces an intelligible idea.

29. el nisós honra. Note the use of the definite article with the possessive. See Grammar IA, 2*b*.

30. un bolo. The use of the word in Spanish (apart from irrelevant meanings like 'skittles', 'large pills') is confined in the sense of 'knife' to the large machetes used by the natives in the Philippines. This would lead one to suspect that the word was actually Tagalog or Visayan in origin, but the only comparable word in Tagalog is *bulos*, 'harpoon'. The Tagalog words for *bolo* are *iták* and *gulok*, with *sundang* in Cebu Visayan, and *binangon* in Ilongo or West Visayan. The etymology of the word in Spanish has not been determined.

30. pelseguí. Sp. *perseguir*, 'to pursue'.

31. que si cosa-cosa el que ta visá. *Que* is here a quite indeterminate connective. *Cosa el que* (cf. below *cosa el que ya sucedé contigo*)

is simply 'what'. The reduplication gives it indefinite and emphatic force: 'whatever', 'anything at all'.

Avisar is used in *germanía* or slang to mean 'notice', as here; it may be, however, that this *visá* is derived from *divisar* rather than *avisar*. The sense of it is that he attacked 'whatever he saw', 'everyone in sight'.

25-33. na pondo del nubes. Is this 'against the bottom of the clouds' or 'in the depths of the clouds'? If the first, we should expect *contra* instead of *na* (or some Ermitaño compound like *na contra de*); if the second the word *topá* (Sp. *topar*, 'to bump into', 'to knock against') is difficult to explain.

33. del nubes que ta sostené el mar. Grammatically the construction is here ambiguous: 'the clouds which support the sea' or, as common sense dictates, 'the clouds which the sea supports'. Note, however, that this ambiguity is due, not simply to the elimination of flexions, but to an adherence to the fluidity of Spanish word-order. There exists, in other words, in the contact vernaculars, the possibility of ambiguity because of a failure to adopt rigid syntactical rules after having abandoned flexion.

34. na sus ojos. See Grammar IV, 12.

34. ya abrí ele bueno el ojos. 'She opened her eyes fully'. In Spanish *abrir bien los ojos*. Ermitaño has made the usual adjustment, and uses the adjective for the adverb.

37. pápag. Tagalog *papag*, a low bamboo bed.

37. petate. Sp. *petate* < Nahuatl *petlatl*, 'a straw mat'. Its use is confined almost entirely to Mexico, where it has now extended meanings of 'sleeping-mat', 'bed-clothes', and 'luggage'. Here the sequence of *pápag*, *petate*, and *almohada* indicates the second meaning.

39. protá. Sp. *frotar*, 'to rub'.

39. presigná. Sp. *persignarse*, 'to cross oneself', with the usual loss of the reflexive in Ermitaño, and a metathesis which is not unusual. See 'The Sound-system of the Contact Vernaculars', p. 105.

40. sueños. For the use of a plural where Spanish would use a singular, see Grammar II, 7.

40. un lágrimas. See Grammar II, 7.

41. que ta comprá . . . con una mujer. The Spanish construction for 'to buy something from someone' requires an *a*. Since *con* regularly takes the place of the Spanish personal *a*, its use has here been extended to a construction in which *a* is not simply the sign of the personal accusative.

42. por carretadas. This should mean 'by the cart-load', but if it does the sense is not clear, even if one does not take it literally.

43. palabras gordo. Colloquial Spanish *palabra gorda*, 'coarse word', an oath or an obscenity.

25-45. ladrona. For the conservation of the feminine form see Grammar II, 5*b*.

45. robá vos el cualta con vos nana. *Robá* would seem to be an imperative, 'Go and steal money from your mother'; but if the sense were 'You would steal money from your own mother', then no auxiliary, *ta*, *ya*, or *de*, would adequately translate it, and it is possible that *robá* is here some kind of infinitive; the intention of the sentence is clear, though the exact translation of it remains obscure.

45. nana. Tagalog *nanay*, 'mother'. Cf. *tay* and *tata*. Ermitaño also uses the form *nay*.

26-01. sí na ñga. *Ñga* [ŋa] is the Tagalog emphatic particle *ngâ* or *ngani*, 'indeed'. *Na*, probably the Tagalog adverb *na*, 'already', seems to be here no more than an additional emphatic.

01. barato. This Spanish adjective is used as an adverb in Spanish also in the phrase *vender barato*.

02. usted no más el santo. See note on *no más* 24.04. Translate, ironically, 'Of course you are a perfect saint!' (literally, 'Only you the saint!').

03. rayo. Here an expletive, something equivalent to 'Thunder and lightning!'

03. de platicá, platicá pa vos. The difficulty here lies in the interpretation of *pa*. It could not very well be the Tagalog particle *pa* which is properly an adverbial prefix; but the existence of *pa* in Tagalog (it is also used to express purpose) may have assisted the reduction of Sp. *para* to *pa*, a form to be observed in hasty or vulgar speech in Spanish itself. *Pa* is used for *para* in Indo-Portuguese also. The translation of the phrase would then be, 'If you're going to talk, talk to yourself' = 'Don't talk to me: it is equally applicable to yourself' = 'People in glass houses . . .', 'Listen to the pot calling the kettle black', or some such phrase.

04. yo ba no hay boca. *Ba* is the interrogative or dubitative particle. The use of *hay* with a personal pronoun is peculiar to the contact vernaculars, where the function of *tiene* has also become confused with that of *hay*. We find, therefore, *tiene un hombre* alongside *hay un hombre* for 'there is (was) a man'; and *yo tiene boca* alongside *yo hay boca* for 'I have a mouth'. Notice the position of the negative in this interrogative sentence. See Grammar V, 16.

05. saragate. Sp. *saraguate*, a species of Central American monkey. The word, and the monkey, are restricted to Guatemala and Nicaragua, while a similar animal is known in Colombia and Venezuela by a related word, *araguato*. The original meaning of the word has been lost in Ermitaño, and it has become simply a term of abuse.

06. un pescao. Sp. *pescado*, 'fish', in a general and collective sense. In Spanish the word cannot be used with the indefinite article, and one would, in this instance, be obliged to use *pez*.

26-06. atizá. Sp. *atizar* has the sense of 'strike' only in colloquial usage.

08. cosa. This inevitably reminds one of the Italian idiom in which *cosa* stands for *che cosa*, 'what'. It is used, however, in Spanish also, though more rarely: *Cosa dijo?* 'Did you say something?' whence by an easy semantic change to 'What did you say?' *Cosa quiere?* is a frequent shopkeepers' greeting in Spain. There is no reason to suppose that the Spanish idiom owes anything to Italian, or that this Ermitaño usage may not be a quite independent development.

08. grandísima. *Grandísima* in Spanish has come to be as gross an insult as the suppressed word which one is expected to understand. For the *-ísimo* termination and the conservation of the feminine form of the adjective see Grammar III, 8*b*.

08. ya mirá vos na mi casa ningún mujel. Spanish would demand a double negative: *Usted* no *vió en mi casa* ninguna *mujer*.

09. chispeá. Sp. *chispear*, 'to give off sparks', has extended meanings which are none of them pejorative: 'to be brilliant', 'to scintillate', etc. The meaning here, 'to quarrel', is an Ermitaño development, unless one can connect it, through Indo-Portuguese and Ternateño, with the Portuguese *chispar*, which does have the meaning of 'to be in a rage'.

10. pichí. Perhaps this is Tagalog *pisíl*, 'hold', 'press' or 'squeeze', although there is also Tagalog *piksí*, 'to jerk'.

10. gañote. Sp. *gañote*, 'throat'. Its use in Spanish is familiar.

11. sucio. Sp. *sucio*, 'dirty'. The Spanish adjective has here been substantivized to acquire the sense of Spanish *suciedad*, 'dirt'.

11. sampegá. Tagalog slang *sampigahín*, 'to slap, beat' someone; probably from Sp. *pegar*.

12. purioso. Balmori has *puriosa*. See Grammar III, 8*b*.

12. un olas. See Grammar II, 7.

13. si quilaya de grande el suñgay. . . . I confess myself defeated by this phrase; I can hazard no guess as to the etymology of *quilaya*, and modern speakers of Ermitaño did not know the word, though Santos y Gómez, for Caviteño, offers the translation, 'whatever'.

13. suñgay. Tagalog *sungay* [ˈsuŋaĭ], 'horn'.

15. como rayo que ya estallá un vez. The exact sense of the comparison is not clear. Is it 'Like a thunderbolt which once exploded', or is it another example of the limitations of the Ermitaño verbal system? Since the very meaning of the word *estallá* precludes the possibility of a form with *ta*, which indicates progressive action, and since without some particle the verb is an infinitive or an imperative, it is probable that the perfective *ya* indicates no more than instantaneous present action, 'Like a thunderbolt which suddenly explodes'. See Grammar V, 14.

18. el orejas de ele ya resoná un puelte ruido. Perhaps the text should be emended to *Na el orejas . . .* or *ya resoná con un puelte ruido.*

It is certainly an example of mixed construction, but it is possible that it is intentional.

26-22. un gumamelas. The Spanish word *gumamela* is identical with the Tagalog *gumamela*, *Hibiscus rosa-sinensis* L., a variety of hibiscus. The flower, of course, is red. For the plural form see Grammar II, 7.

23. lancape. Balmori spells this *lankape* which suggests that he knew the word was not Spanish. But it does not seem to be Tagalog either, and I could get no explanation of it from modern Ermitaño-speakers.

24. si cosa el que ya sucedé contigo. Translate, 'If there is something that has happened to you . . .'.

25. desgraciada. For the feminine form see Grammar III, 8*b*.

26. solamente. Ermitaño does not have adverbs in *-mente*. From here to the end of the story there is an increasing amount of contamination by contact with correct Spanish.

26. como ta llorá el mana estrella. 'As the stars weep'. It is difficult to see the point of this simile.

27. altor. Sp. *altor* (like *amargor*, *blancor*, *dulzor*, etc.) is a variant of the much more frequent *altura* (*amargura*, *blancura*, *dulzura*, etc.). This may indicate an archaizing tendency.

28. el llantos. For the plural see Grammar II, 7.

28. sahig. Tagalog *sahíg*, 'floor'.

30. no . . . más que. 'Only with'. Spanish would use *más que* after the preposition *con: con más que. . . .*

31. cosa-cosa medicinas. 'Medicines', to which the *cosa-cosa* gives a slightly pejorative sense.

32. un estrellas. See Grammar II, 7.

34. media noche. The feminine form of the adjective is retained in this set phrase. See Grammar II, 5*b*.

34. media noche ya. Here the *ya* clearly retains all its Spanish adverbial force. This may be due to the contamination which is particularly obvious in these last few paragraphs.

39. muelto como un pájaro. See the note on the simile *como un pájaro*, 24.30

41. na junto el pies. The Spanish preposition is *junto a*. Ermitaño usually converts such prepositions into *na — de*, in this case *na junto de*. It is surprising to find that *junto* is not substantivized, but perhaps the phrase should be emended to *na junto del pies del padre cura*.

42. nacú. Tagalog *iná ku* or *nakú*, 'woe!'

43. saná. Sp. *sanar*, 'to recover from an illness'.

26-43. armá-armá. This is a Tagalog device of which we shall find more examples in Caviteño. The effect of the reduplication is either to indicate repetitive action, or simply to give emphasis.

43. armá-armá escándalo. Sp. *armar escándalo*, 'to cause a scandal', or, in its more familiar usage, 'to create a scene'.

43. no saná ele armá-armá escándalo. Thus Balmori. I am inclined to emend: *No saná ele con armá-armá escándalo*, 'Your making a scene won't help him to recover'. Even without the *con* this is clearly the meaning of the sentence.

44. saca. Sp. *sacar*, 'take out'. The sense of 'carry off' or 'take away', which we must understand here, is an extension of the Spanish meaning.

47. pol causa de mío. 'It is my fault' or 'It is because of me'.

27-02. el muerte que ya matá con el amor. One is tempted to think of a Spanish *la muerte, que ya mata con el amor*, which would mean something like 'Death, which has now found a way to kill with love'. But the translation is probably simply 'Death, which has killed with love (before now, and now does again)'.

04. ta consolá, ta consolá siempre. As it stands, with suitable alterations of the flexions: *consuela, consuela siempre*, this might be Spanish. I am inclined, however, to emend to *ta consolá-consolá*, Tagalizing the construction, for though there is, of course, little difference, and the device of repetition is common to all languages, the frequency of this construction in Ermitaño and Caviteño suggests that it is Tagalog in origin.

06. hija mía. For the feminine form of the substantive and the agreement of the adjective see Grammar II, 5*b*, and III, 8*c*.

07. el mana dolor, ta pasá. Translate, 'Sorrows pass'.

10. ta morí . . . cuando ya retirá. This is a good illustration of the use of *ta* and *ya* to indicate imperfect and perfective aspect. See Grammar V, 14.

11. tres días ya el que ya volá. The first *ya* is used adverbially, as in Spanish.

14. casancapan. Tagalog *kasangkapan*, 'household belongings'.

15. ele ta sobrá ya. *Ya* is again the Spanish adverb.

19. todo el luz. In Spanish one would have *la luz* or *todas las luces*—not, that is to say, *toda la luz*.

22. desde el playa. Balmori has *desde la playa*, another example of contamination in the latter part of this story.

23. dormí. The original text has *dormir*. One might even emend this further, to *dolmí*.

23. masiao puelte mi sueño. This might be freely translated: 'For this nightmare I am living is beyond my strength'.

27-25. poco-poco. 'Slowly'. See Grammar III, 10.

31. humildemente. Ermitaño would say *humilde*. The form with *–mente* is due to Spanish contamination.

35. dentro de su carne. In Ermitaño this should be *na dentro de su carne*. The final paragraphs of this text are very much contaminated by reminiscence of Spanish usage (the use of *ya* as an adverb, the use of the article *la*, agreement of adjectives with Spanish feminine nouns, Spanish verb forms, the Spanish adverb with *–mente*, etc.). It is possible that these errors are due to the author, but it seems unlikely that Balmori should not have revised his text, or that he should have committed these solecisms in the first place. The nature of their occurrence, that is towards the end of a lengthy passage, would seem to point to the error of a transcriber or type-setter rather than an author.

CHAPTER IV

CAVITEÑO: TEXTS AND NOTES

Bibliographical Note—Text I: *Pedro, el Muchacho Cucinero*—Text II: *El Vieja Religioso y su Puelco*—Texts III: Nursery Rhymes and Proverbs—Notes.

Bibliographical Note

Probably the most thorough piece of work on the Caviteño dialect to date is a thesis for the Master's degree at the University of the Philippines written by Alfredo Germán, a native of San Roque, in 1933. All but one of the copies of this work were lost during the war, and the surviving copy could not be traced when I was in Manila.[1] It consists of 400 folio pages: Part I deals with the grammar, Part II is a vocabulary, and Part III is an anthology of about eleven pieces. León M. Guerrero translated two poems of Rizal into Caviteño for inclusion in the anthology.

Another and earlier thesis, also for the M.A. degree, is Antonio Santos y Gómez's 'Caviteño Dialect' of 1924, which is no. 448 in volume XII of the Beyer collection of Tagalog Papers. This work consists of a brief account of the origin of the dialect, which makes no mention of Ternateño and is largely imaginative; a brief and totally unscientific account of some of its phonetic features (thus *vos* is derived from *vosotros*, and *binia* < *ven ya* is 'explained': *v* becomes *b*, *e* becomes *i*, *y* becomes *i*); a sketch of the grammar with which I am compelled to disagree (see Grammar, *passim*); and a series of texts, exceedingly sparsely annotated, which are quite its most valuable feature. With Dr Beyer's permission, I reproduce part of these texts here.

Text I

Pedro, el Muchacho Cucinero

Pedro, hijo di Ñora Culasa, buenung-bueno cucí cumida. Su nana ta-si ingrandicí con ele con todo el mañga gente.

Un día, Pedro ya siguí con su nana na patio para cumprá vianda. Su nana alcabal di cumprá cangrejo, ya jablá con Pedro:

— Bueno, ritirá ya vos, llivá vos este mañga cangrejo y cucí vos bueno-bueno, ha?

— Sí, nay, ya rispundí Pedro, y ya ritirá ya ele.

Ya puní ele todo el mañga cangrejo na un olla, y ya principiá di puní puego al calán. Cuando ya mirá ele con el mañga cangrejo, ta brinca-
10 brincá na olla.

Ya jablá ele:

> Cangrejo, cangrejo,
> Cómo vusós ta brinca-brincá?

[1] Since Dr Cecilio López assumed office as Acting Director of the Institute of National Language, the thesis has been found, and is now in the library of the Institute.

> Calienteng-caliente ba vusós ta sintí
> Allí na calán?
> No vale, luegung rato
> Di quitá yo con vusós
> Y aquí na mi barriga
> Derecho-derecho di intrá vusós.

Ta jilví-y-jilví ñga el agua, pero el cangrejo no ta quidá blando. Tiene más di tres hora na calán y no pa blando.

— Abá, no pa blando! Taldang-talda quidá cucido pala este mañga cangrejo, ya jablá Pedro. 10

Ahora, cuando ya lligá su nana, ya priguntá ele:

— Pedro, no pa ba vos ya cucí el mañga cangrejo, ha?

— Taldang-talda, nay, pala quidá cucido el cangrejo; tres hora ta jilví-jilví, no pa blando, ya rispundí Pedro, con su cara iscurung-iscuro polcaso ta pastidiá ya ele, no más ya quidá cucido.

— Abá no, ya rispundí insiguidas su nana, no sabe pa ba vos cucí cangrejo hasta ahora? Mirá yo!

Y ya abrí ele el olla. Pero cuando ya chuchá ele un cangrejo, ya sumí su dedo adentro.

— Abá, nuay más laman el mañga cangrejo, cosa vos ya jací? Qué 20 salvaje! Ta pinsá yo sabeng-sabe ya vos cucí.

Text II

El Vieja Religioso y su Puelco

Con aquel vez, na un pueblo aquí na provincia di Cavite, tiene, dici, un vieja ta quidá solo-solo na un cubo. Ele ta ganá su vida na modo cuida-cuidá puelco no más.

Ele ta pidi-pidí el mañga sobra di cumida, lavadura, y pono di plátanos qui ya dale pruta ya con el mañga vicinos. Ta cuidá di mañga puelco chiquitito, y cuando grande, ya ta vindí ele para tiní qui gastá. El mañga pariente di esta vieja, dici, dimasiao jambre; no quiere mantiní, ni dale limosna con el pobre vieja. Este vieja dimasiao religioso; todo el día, 30 timpranung-timprano, ta andá primero uí misa antes qui trabajá.

Un noche, el pobre vieja nuay qui cumí, y nuay ni un céntimos qui gastá tamién; ele ya quidá tristing-triste, ta gutiá su lágrimas con el hambre, y ta timblá su cuelpo. Ele ta rugá no más con Dios para dale con ele puelza y paciencia para pudí suprí todo aquel mañga calamidad qui ta pasá con ele, si no pa para murí.

Bago, ya salí ele na cucina, ya sacá el cumida di puelco y ya llamá con su mañga puelco, 'Hecha, hecha!' Y todo ilós, tiene más di diez, ya atracá. Cuando ele ta dale cumí, y ta mirá quilaya di sabroso ta cumí su mañga puelco, y con su hambre ta pudí ele llurá, y después ya suspirá 40 el pobre:

— Ay, Dios mío, bueno pa este mañga puelco, nuay qui ta culdá nada, y tiene qui cumí cuando ta lligá el hora di cumida.

Dale qui dale ele cumí, pero aquel un puelco inajin, compolme ta cumí, un ratung-rato ta-si suncal na su saya, y después ta caminá apuera

na sulal, y allí entre mañga zacate ta-si suncal qui ta-si suncal como qui quiere visá qui tiene alguna cosa gualdao allí. El vieja ya mira-mirá con el puelco y ya pinsa-pinsá ele cosa quiere jablá aquel puelco.

— Cosa qu'haya tiene allí na sulal entre mañga zacate? Cómo este puelco suncal qui suncal allá y no quiere más cumí? ya jablá el vieja con su mismo.

— Ispirá ñga, di mirá yo, ya pinsá ele y ya salí apuera donde ta-si suncal el puelco.

Ya mira-mirá ele na zacate, ya gribata un poco, pero nuay nada tamiera 10 ya incuntrá ele. Ya quidá medio triste, medio rigañao ele y ya jablá:

— Salvaje puelco éste, no sabe si cosa quiere.

Pero el puelco ta-si suncal qui ta-si suncal siempre; intonces el vieja ya sacá el pala y ya gribata más jondo. Cuando ele gribata qui ta gribata, su pala ya tupá na un tibol qui ya quibrá con el golpe del pala. O ya mirá ele el tibol llenung-lleno di oro! El vieja ya quidá ispantanao, y no sabe si cosa di jací; ya tarantá ele, ya currí na su cubo, ya sacá un saco di arroz vacío; dispués ya puní ele todo el oro qui pudí llivá ele na saco, y ya llivá na su cubo. Con aquel mismo noche el vieja carriá qui ya carriá el oro na su cubo; ya puní na otro tibol y dispués ya intirrá bajo 20 casa para no di-si mirá otro gente.

El vieja ya quidá alegreng-alegre, ya andá na tienda cumprá sopas para pasá su hambre; el tindera, dici, ya ispantá donde ya sacá el vieja aquel cualta di oro, pero ele no quiere visá. El vieja con el alegría no puede dolmí con aquel noche, ya andá misa timpranung-timprano para dale gracias con Dios y dispués ya ritirá ya ele na su cubo.

Como todo el cualta qui ta gastá el vieja oro, el mañga vicinos ya tiní suspecha con ele, ya-si subuk-subuk y pol pin ya sabí siempre todo, qui ele ya incuntrá dos tibol di cualta oro. Poreso, desde con aquél, todo el mañga vicinos ta jablá qui tiene suelte, dici aquel vieja religioso, con 30 quien el mañga pariente no quiere mantiní; mañga mal conciencia.

El vieja ya mandá jací un casa di materiales puelte, y con aquel puelco inajin qui ya dale con ele todo su riqueza, ya cuidá ele buenung-bueno, ta dale puro buen cumida, ya ta cuidá ele arriba di casa.

Cuando el puelco ya murí, el vieja ya intirrá con ele allá na mismo lugal donde ya incuntrá el dos tibol di oro, y mandá jací un monumento a memoria del puelco.

Y el vieja ya viví peliz hasta cuando ele tamién ya murí.

TEXTS III

Ramón Tamad

Ramón, tamad na tamad,
40 Alcabal di cumí, para no ricugí,
Di iscundí na sulal y di-si jelad-jelad
Con su mañga helmano qui ta ricugí.

Un día ñga cuando ele ya iscundí ya
Bajo un pono di camanchilis grande,

Arriba del pono ya mirá ele ñga
Un duende, el ojos grandeng-grande.

— Nanay, nanay! ya grita qui ya gritá
Con todo el miedo, Ramón tamad;
Y al lligando na casa, con ele tamién ñga
Su mañga helmano ya-si jelad-jelad.

Maltín Piscadol

Maltín piscadol,
tucá pito, tucá tambol.
10 Ta lluví, ta salí sol,
ta casá el niña con el ispañol.

El Soltero

El soltero si ta-si nuyo,
lliva-llivá el bucayo;
Y cuando casao,
lliva-llivá el pamalo.

Proverbs

El gente no siguro, ta pisá blando, ta pisá duro.
Vos como Ñol Crispín, tiene principio, nuay pin.
Vos como Ñol Lionzo, más viejo, más sonso.
20 Murí jaltao, no tasao.
Grande, cubalde; chiquito, maldito.
Bueno pa un joven pamparón qui un viejo cabrón.
Bueno pa un muchacho tragón qui uno ladrón.
Bueno pa talde qui nunca.
Ojos qui no ta mirá, corazón no ta padicí.
Grande cabeza, nuay laman.
El dalaga guapa, demonio del bolsa.
Si cosa el tata, no aquél el hijo.

NOTES

Text I

50-01. di. Sp. *de*. For the raising of *e* to *i* and *o* to *u* see 'The Sound-system of the Contact Vernaculars', p. 108.

01. Ñora. Sp. *señora*. Although the dropping of the initial syllable has many parallels in the contact vernaculars, yet it is suggestive that the form *Ñora* is typically Mexican.

01. Culasa. A shortened form of *Nicolasa*.

01. di Ñora Culasa. Spanish would require the definite article: *de la Señora Nicolasa*. In Tagalog also the article is normally required with proper names, though many educated Tagalogs do not use it (perhaps because of English influence?). This Tagalog article, however, is inflected,

and has an 'attributive' form, corresponding more or less to an Indo-European genitive. For a proper noun this attributive article is *ni*. So: 'Pedro is a friend of Captain Berong' becomes *Si Pedro'y kaibigan ni Kapitáng Berong*, literally, 'The Pedro is friend of-the Captain Berong'. It is possible, therefore, that *di* does not indicate the omission of the Spanish article, but rather the incorporation of an article by analogy with Tagalog *ni*.

A feature of contact vernaculars which has received very little attention is the way in which, at the same time as European flexions are eliminated or reduced in number, the native flexions of the substratum also undergo simplification. The Tagalog inflexion of the definite article here survives in very simplified form. There is, perhaps, a parallel in the way in which speakers of Chinook, the Indian language, accepted into Chinook, the contact vernacular, the French word *lepié* < *le pied* as a substitute for their own variously inflected words indicating each inseparably both 'foot' and the owner of the foot. See Grammar IA, 1*b* (ii).

50-01. buenung-bueno. See note below on *bueno-bueno* 50.05, and Grammar III, 10.

01. ta-si. Santos y Gómez has a note explaining this as 'is doing'. While this is clearly no explanation, and as a translation is inadequate, it is important to understand that there is no reflexive, even though *si* is derived from the Spanish reflexive *se*. See Grammar V, 13*c* and 14.

02. ingrandicí. Sp. *engrandecer* has the secondary meaning of 'to praise'.

01. ta-si ingrandicí con ele con todo el mañga gente. The *si* has the effect of intensifying the progressive aspect of *ta*. Translate, 'His mother was forever praising him to everybody she met'.

02. con ele. Note that every pronominal object, whether personal (cf. Spanish personal *a*) or impersonal, must be prefaced by *con*.

02. mañga. Tagalog *mangá*. The particle occurs in Ermitaño as *mana*. Note that in Caviteño, as in Ermitaño, the noun need not then take any plural flexion: *el mañga cangrejo* means 'the crabs'.

03. ya siguí. For the forms of the verbs see the preceding section on Ermitaño, and Grammar V.

03. ya siguí con su nana. 'Accompanied his mother'. It would seem, at first glance, that Spanish *seguir*, 'to follow', had undergone a slight semantic change. But *con su nana* does not mean 'with his mother'; it is no more than the Caviteño method of expressing the Spanish personal accusative. *Siguí con su nana* = Sp. *seguir a su mamá*, which, though the phrase may be accounted ambiguous, we may perfectly well translate as 'accompany his mother'.

03. na. See the notes on Ermitaño, and Grammar IA, 2, and VI, 17.

03. patio. Sp. *patio* designates merely a courtyard (with other less relevant meanings). In Caviteño it has acquired other senses, first 'square' (in a town, replacing Sp. *plaza*) and, then, by a simple transference, the sense of 'market' as here.

50-03. vianda. Sp. *vianda*, 'food', very infrequently used.

04. alcabal di. Santos y Gómez offers no comment on or translation of the difficult *alcabal*. I was inclined to emend his spelling to *al cabal*, for it is unlikely that *alcabal* could be derived from Sp. *acabar*, especially since the word appears in Caviteño as *cabá*, and the syntax of the phrase is the same as Sp. *al acabar de*. The survival of this locution would be surprising if we were to take it as an example of a living construction. But there is no possibility of saying in Caviteño *al entrá* and the like. The Spanish construction ('on —ing') is here simply a fossil, and *alcabal di*, Sp. *al acabar de*, which might be translated 'on completing', means in Caviteño no more than 'after'. I have therefore retained Santos y Gómez's spelling of it as one word.

04. cangrejo. Santos y Gómez spells the word *kang-grejo*, a pointless deformation of the Spanish.

05. ritirá. Sp. *retirar*, 'withdraw'. Although semantically the word cannot be said to have undergone any essential change, the Spanish *retírese* savours of the tone a lord would employ in addressing an inferior. In Spanish, of course, the verb is reflexive when it is not transitive.

05. vos. See Grammar IV, 11*b*.

05. bueno-bueno. The reader (see phonetic transcription, p. 118) made Santos y Gómez's *bueno-bueno* into *buenung-bueno*, but I have not emended the text because Santos y Gómez, in his grammatical analysis, attempts to make a distinction between the two forms.

He writes as follows: the superlative of the *adjective* is formed by adding *-ng* or *-ung* to the first element, *buenung-bueno*, *guapang-guapa*, ('the best', etc.). Simple repetition of the adjective indicates no more than English 'very', so that *nisós ya cugi piscao grande-grande* means 'we caught some (or 'a') very big fish'. He notes, however, that with *adverbs* a real superlative and the idea of 'very' are conveyed indifferently by reduplication, with or without *-ng*.

I cannot agree with this analysis. In the first place, no distinction is made in any of the contact vernaculars between adjective and adverb, and in many cases it is almost impossible to say whether examples of such reduplicated adjective-adverbs qualify nouns or modify verbs. Is *calienteng-caliente*, for instance, in *calienteng-caliente ba vusós ta sintí?* adverb or adjective? If it *is* an adjective, as it would be in Spanish, then Santos y Gómez's ruling is wrong, since the sense must be 'very hot' and not 'the hottest'. In *con su cara iscurung-iscuro*, *iscuro* is definitely an adjective; and yet the sense of it cannot possibly be superlative in the meaning Santos y Gómez gives to the term ('the darkest').

While reserving for the Grammar (*q.v.* III, 10) detailed discussion of the comparison and intensification of adjectives and adverbs in the contact vernaculars, I must here, briefly, make the following points: (1) the contact vernaculars make no distinction between adjectives and adverbs;

(2) in all Santos y Gómez's texts there is not one example of a genuine superlative ('most of all'), and in every instance reduplication with or without the connective would have to be translated as 'very', if the force of it is not diminutive; (3) in Tagalog this reduplication of the adjective indicates indifferently the conceptions 'too' and 'very', and a quite different construction is employed to express the idea of 'most of all'; (4) the connective *-ng* is not the only connective, and is proper only with words ending in a vowel. Although all the Spanish adjectives concerned do end in vowels, there is an example of the Tagalog *ma dalás*, 'often', in reduplicated form, *dalás-dalás*, where the proper Tagalog connective, in this case *na*, is *not* used. That is to say, a simplification of the Tagalog practice is evident in Caviteño.

(5) Repetition to indicate intensification is a device common to every language. Even though it may be frowned on in the literary language it inevitably crops up in children's or affective speech: *very very big*, *you bad bad boy*, etc. Although it is obvious that in the Philippine contact vernaculars it is connected in the first instance with a formal device in Tagalog, involving the use of a connective, there is no reason for supposing that *bueno-bueno* means in Caviteño more than what it says, i.e. 'good-good'. It is simply an emphatic which our more formal language must render as 'very good'. In Chinese reduplication exists alongside the use of the particle *hên*^{3} meaning 'very', but no distinction is observed in their use, so that *hên hao*^{3} 很好 and *hao-hao*, in the spoken language, convey the same meaning of 'very good'.

50-06. ha? The contact vernaculars already make use of the Tagalog interrogative and dubitative particle *ba*, but we may see here the beginnings of another one, used as interrogative particles are most often used, at the end of the sentence. (Cf. Sp. *verdad;* Portuguese *pois não;* English *isn't it*, etc.; French *n'est-ce pas;* Chinese *mo°* 麽 etc.)

08. puní. Sp. *poner.*

08. principiá. Sp. *principiar*, 'to begin'; but the word is rarely used in Spanish, and is a barbarism when used with an infinitive, as here.

08. principiá di puní. *Principiar* does not take any preposition after it in Spanish, since such a construction is impossible, but all the other verbs meaning 'to begin' take *a* (*comenzar*, *empezar*, *ponerse*, *meterse*, etc.).

09. al calán. Santos y Gómez has, presumably a misprint, *el calán.* I should, perhaps, have emended '*con el calán*', since we have in these texts no other example of *al* 's occurring in just this way.

09. calán. Tagalog *kalán*, 'cooking-stove'.

09. brinca-brincá. Spanish *brincar*, 'to jump', 'jump about', could not be used of crabs in a pot, however active they were. Note, therefore, a slight semantic change.

The reduplication of the verb is termed by Santos y Gómez the 'present progressive form'. For the verb see Grammar V, 14; for the functions of reduplication see Grammar VII. Note also the dislocation of the accent in this reduplicated form.

50-13. vusós. Sp. *vosotros.* Note that *vos* in Caviteño is singular; *vusós* is plural—a very curious development. For personal pronouns in the contact vernaculars see Grammar IV, 11.

51-03. no vale. Translate, 'It won't do you any good'. This is one of the few examples of the survival of a Spanish verb in an unmodified form. See Grammar V, 13*b*.

03. luegung rato. Santos y Gómez offers the translation 'just a little while more' without further comment. It seems to me that the phrase is probably the product of popular etymology (or Santos y Gómez's transcription) and the phrase *luego un rato*, which could be translated 'after a while'.

04. quitá. Sp. *quitar* means 'take off' or 'take away', never 'take out', for which Spanish would use *sacar.*

06. derecho-derecho. 'Straight'. Sp. *derecho* in an intensive construction.

07. ta jilví-y-jilví. Santos y Gómez has *jilví-y-jilví* (without the *ta*), and, for sole comment on the whole sentence, offers the translation 'boiling'. My Caviteño speaker (see phonetic transcription) emended this to *ta jilví-y-jilví*, as I have done in the text.

Phonetically it is very difficult to distinguish between *jilví-y-jilví*, and *jilví-jilví.* The form with the conjunction is interesting psychologically: the primitive reduplication suffers a kind of logical analysis. See Grammar VII, 18.

07. ñga. Tagalog *ngâ* or *nganì*, an emphatic particle.

07. el cangrejo. 'The crabs'. See Grammar II, 6.

07. tiene. Sp. *tiene*, 'has'. Note the unmodified survival of the Spanish verb. Its retention in Caviteño (as also in Ermitaño and Zamboangueño) has been assisted by a change in the meaning, exactly paralleling the development of Sp. *hay*, Portuguese *há*, French *il y a* < Latin *habet*, 'has'. *Tiene* in the contact vernaculars means 'there is' or 'there are'.

In this particular context one might imagine that *tiene* retains something of its Spanish meaning, since in such a context *tener* might be used in Spanish.

08. tres hora. Note the uninflected plural. See Grammar II, 6*e*.

08. no pa. This is a rendering of Tagalog *hindî pa*, equivalent to Spanish *todavía no*, 'not yet'.

09. abá. Tagalog *abá*, an interjection, 'What!'

09. taldang-talda. Sp. *tarde*, 'late'. Note the modification of the final vowel.

09. pala. Tagalog *palá*, an interjectional particle used to express surprise: 'so', 'so then'. Santos y Gómez notes that *pala* 'gives emphasis'.

51-12. no pa ba. Santos y Gómez writes *no-pa-ba*, which I emend, since there is no essential connection between *no pa* and *ba*, while there is equally no reason for writing *no pa* with a hyphen, especially when it occurs elsewhere without one. Translate the sentence, 'Haven't you cooked the crabs yet?'

12. ya cucí. Santos y Gómez has *ta cucí*, which may be a misprint. In any case it is clearly wrong, for the perfective aspect of the verb is obviously necessary. *No pa ba vos ta cucí el mañga cangrejo?* would mean, 'Aren't you cooking the crabs yet? = 'Haven't you started to cook those crabs yet?' which is surely not what is intended.

13. quidá cucido. Note the omission of an auxiliary particle, probably because *quidá* retains some of its Spanish force as an auxiliary verb itself.

13. tres hora ya ta jilví-jilví. Note the progressive aspect of the verb: 'they have been boiling for three hours now'.

15. pastidiá. Sp. *fastidiar*, 'to annoy'. *Pastidiá* is here equivalent to Sp. *fastidiarse*, 'to become annoyed'. Santos y Gómez gives the translation 'tired', but the cara *iscurung-iscuro* would seem to suggest annoyance rather than fatigue.

15. no más ya quidá cucido. This is Pedro talking again: 'They'll never be cooked'.

16. insiguidas. Sp. *en seguida*, 'immediately'. The final *-s* may have arisen by analogy with other Spanish adverbs and adverbial phrases, the original and etymological *-s* of *menos, más, jamás, después, atrás*, having already been extended to *antes, quizás, mientras, entonces*, and to such phrases as *de veras, a hurtadillas, a ciegas*, etc.

16. no sabe pa ba vos. 'Don't you know yet?'

16. sabe. Note the lack of an auxiliary particle.

17. hasta ahora. This is pleonastic with the Tagalog particle *pa.*

17. mirá yo. This is not 'watch me', which would be *mirá conmigo*, but 'let me look'.

18. chuchá. I assume that this is Sp. *chuchear*, which means to hunt small game with nets, snares, etc. Here the sense has been extended to 'attempt to get hold of', or something similar. Santos y Gómez is silent on the point.

18. ya sumí su dedo adentro. The sense of this is clear; the syntax is not. *Sumí* in Caviteño means 'sink' in both its transitive and intransitive senses (differentiated in Spanish by *sumir* and *sumirse*). The flexibility of contact-vernacular word-order, and the possibility of sometimes omitting a pronoun object leave the phrase open to two interpretations: 'Her finger sank into it' or 'She plunged her finger into it'. However, the consistency with which the pronominal object is inserted in this text leads me to favour the former translation.

20. nuay. Sp. *no hay*, 'there is not'. See the note below, 51.20.

51-20. laman. Tagalog *lamán*, 'meat', 'contents'.

20. nuay más laman el mañga cangrejo. For the confusion of *hay* and *tiene* in the contact vernaculars see the notes to the Ermitaño text. Translate, 'The crabs have no meat left in them'.

20. cosa. 'What?' See the note on its occurrence in the Ermitaño text.

21. salvaje. Sp. *salvaje*, with a slight weakening of its force. Spanish would use, colloquially, a comparable phrase, *Qué barbaridad.*

21. ta pinsá. Santos y Gómez has *pinsaba*, the Spanish imperfect tense (*pensaba*), and makes no comment on it. *Pinsaba* would indicate Spanish contamination.

21. ta pinsá yo sabeng-sabe vos cucí. 'And I thought you knew how to cook!'

21. sabeng-sabe. The intensitive construction gives the verb the force of something like 'really know'. Note the lack of an auxiliary particle. See Grammar V, 13*b*, and VII.

Text II

51-22. vieja. Here the Spanish feminine form of the adjective, substantivized, has a genuine semantic function: 'the old woman'. See Grammar II, 5*b*.

23. con aquel vez. This is the Caviteño version of 'once upon a time'. Compare, below, the other expressions of time: *con aquel noche, con aquel tiempo, desde con aquel*, etc.

23. tiene. 'There is' or 'there was'.

23. dici. Sp. *dicen*, or, more probably, *se dice.* This *dici* occurs several times in the text, each time with the sense of 'so the story goes . . .'.

23. tiene un vieja ta quidá solo-solo. The relative has been omitted.

24. un cubo. Tagalog *kubo*, 'hut'.

24. ta ganá su vida. Spanish would use, instead of the possessive, the definite article.

24. na modo. This is a new Caviteño preposition. Almost all the Spanish prepositions have disappeared or lost their force in the contact vernaculars, so that we have only reinforced forms like *na dentro de* in which the preposition has been substantivized (on the pattern of the Tagalog compound prepositions with *sa*). Once this practice is established, it is not difficult to create new prepositions by using *na* with a substantive. Here the word *modo*, 'means', is combined with the ubiquitous *na* to form a preposition with the force of 'by means of'.

24. cuida-cuidá. For the functions of reduplication in Tagalog and the contact vernaculars see Grammar VII.

25. puelco. Note that the word is plural. See Grammar II, 6*d*.

51-24. ta ganá su vida na modo cuida-cuidá puelco no más. 'Keeping pigs was her only means of livelihood'.

26. el mañga sobra di cumida. 'The left-overs'. In Spanish *las sobras* means 'the scraps left over after a meal', i.e. the *di cumida* would be pleonastic in Spanish.

26. lavadura. Santos y Gómez translates this as 'washings'. In Spanish *lavadura* is simply the act of washing, and the sense of it in Caviteño corresponds more, therefore, with that of Sp. *lavazas*, the dirty water after washing up.

26. pono. Tagalog *punò*, 'tree'.

26. pono di plátanos qui ya dale pruta ya. I presume that this means 'banana-trees which had already given their fruit'. But it seems that the fruit-bearing life of a banana-tree is anything from twenty to forty years, so I am a little doubtful about this interpretation.

27. dale. Sp. *dar* with the dative pronoun *le*. The word in Caviteño (and Zamboangueño) means no more than 'give'. The pronoun is regarded as part of the verb, so that one says *dale conmigo*, 'give me', etc. See Grammar V, 13*b*.

27. ta cuidá di mañga puelco. Contrast above *cuida-cuidá puelco*, without the linking preposition. Spanish would insist on the use of *de*.

28. y cuando grande. For this type of ellipsis and omission of the copula see Grammar V, 15.

28. ya ta vindí. 'Then she would sell them'. For verb-forms see Grammar V, 14.

29. dimasiao. Santos y Gómez writes this as *di masiao*, and explains *masiao* as 'very'. But, though the word loses its first syllable in Tagalog *masyado*, the word in Spanish is *demasiado*, and the following sentence, *este vieja dimasiao religioso*, confirms the fact that the *di* is not separable, and that *dimasiao* is the Caviteño equivalent of Ermitaño *masiao*. See Grammar III, 10*c*.

29. jambre. Sp. *hambre*, 'hunger'. Santos y Gómez translates his *jambre* in this one instance as 'stingy'. Elsewhere he writes the word *ambre* (which I spell *hambre*) in contexts which clearly indicate that it means 'hunger' (*ta gutiá su lágrimas con el hambre; y con su hambre ta pudí ele llurá; cumprá sopas para pasá su hambre*). It would be remarkable if a distinction between the two pronunciations of *hambre* had led to a semantic separation, but this does, indeed, seem to be the case. There are, of course, parallels in other languages: differentiation and reaction led to the forms *frais* and *froid* in French, *juerga* and *huelga* in Spanish, *pobre*, 'poor', and *pulube*, 'beggar', in Tagalog.

29. quiere. For the retention of Spanish verbs in their inflected forms in the contact vernaculars see Grammar V, 13*b*.

30. todo el día. Sp. *todos los días*, 'every day'. The context makes it clear that it could not mean 'the whole day'.

51-31. uí misa. Sp. *oír misa*, 'hear mass'. This is the only instance that I have found of the use of *oír* in the contact vernaculars, which prefer such regular verbs as *escuchar* and *entender*, due to the fact that it occurs in a set phrase.

32. el pobre vieja nuay qui cumí. Because of the confusion of the functions of *tiene* and *hay*, *nuay* (< *no hay*) means here 'has not'. *Nuay qui cumí*='has nothing to eat'.

32. un céntimos. For the pluralization of singular nouns see Grammar II, 7.

33. tamién. Sp. *también*, 'also', used only in affirmative sentences. Spanish would require *tampoco*.

33. gutiá. Sp. *gotear*, 'fall in drops'.

36. si no pa para murí. 'If not yet in order to die'. This is ambiguous, in that we are left uncertain as to whether the old woman does or does not expect to die on this occasion.

37. bago. Tagalog *bago*, 'before', 'previously'. Santos y Gómez gives the translation 'after', which involves a semantic change rather difficult to account for.

38. hecha, hecha! Since this would seem to be a pig-calling cry, one cannot attempt to offer any explanation of its origin—though the *e* and the affricate point to a Spanish rather than a Tagalog source. Various primitive societies have recognized a whole series of specialized calls for different animals (Medieval Welsh, for instance), words which do not find their way into literature, and whose etymology is rarely traceable.

38. tiene más di diez. 'There were over ten of them'. Syntactically this must be explained as a parenthetic clause.

39. atracá. Santos y Gómez writes *attraca*, which is probably an error. Spanish *atracar* is normally used for ships mooring (with other less relevant meanings); but by a semantic change exactly paralleling **ad-riparе* > *arriver*, and *plicare* (*vela*) > *llegar*, this nautical term has come to mean in Argentinian Spanish 'approach'. The coincidence is such that we can scarcely dissociate its use in Caviteño from its acceptance in the Argentine, though we must suppose that it was originally a piece of slang which had a wider currency in Spanish America that it has at present.

39. quilaya. 'Whatever', 'what there may be'. The word occurs in Ermitaño also, but I can make no guess at its etymology.

40. y con su hambre. The conjunction is superfluous, for the clause depends on the clauses introduced by *cuando*. This is one of many examples of mixed construction to be found in contact-vernacular syntax.

42. Dios mío. *Mío* survives in this set phrase, as it does in Ermitaño: *Señor Dios mío*.

51-42. bueno pa este mañga puelco. 'These pigs are better off'. This is the Tagalog construction *mabuti pa*, literally 'better yet'. In Caviteño the postponed particle *pa* has become the regular way of expressing comparison. 'Better late than never' is translated *Bueno pa talde qui nunca*. See Grammar III, 10*b*.

42. nuay qui ta culdá nada. The functions of *tiene* and *hay* are confused, the confusion having been assisted perhaps by such locutions as *haber que* and *tener que*, 'to have to', which are identical except that the one is impersonal and the other personal. Translate, 'They don't have to worry about anything'.

42. culdá. Sp. *acordarse de* or *recordar*. The former is the more likely, since the prefix *a-* is the more susceptible to elision; but there has doubtless also been confusion between the two. There has possibly been a slight semantic change, from 'remember' to 'think of' to 'worry about'.

43. el hora di cumida. Here again I suspect that the *di* incorporates a definite article.

44. dale qui dale. The reduplication indicates a progressive aspect. See Grammar V, 14, and VII.

44. inajin. Tagalog *inahin*, 'mother' (of animals only). Santos y Gómez translates *puelco inajin* as 'old sow'.

44. compolme. Sp. *conforme* is usually employed with *a: conforme a*, but it is also used as here: *todo queda conforme estaba*, 'everything is as it was'. The sense of the word has shifted in Caviteño to that of a simple temporal conjunction, 'while'.

45. un ratung-rato. Santos y Gómez translates this as 'once in a while'. The reduplication of a substantive usually indicates a diminutive, so that I should prefer to translate 'for a little while'.

45. suncal. Tagalog *sungkál*, 'uproot with the nose' (as a pig).

52-01. sulal. Sp. *solar*. In the Province of Santander, *solar* has the meaning of 'garden' or 'yard' as here; but the semantic change from 'lot' or 'plot of ground' is not so difficult as to preclude such an independent development in Caviteño.

01. allí. Santos y Gómez writes *all*, and does so on three consecutive occasions (*all entre mañga zacate; alguna cosa gualdao all; cosa qu'haya tiene all na sulal*) without offering any comment on it. Even three misprints are not impossible, and a final [ʎ] (if that, indeed, is the pronunciation intended) is unthinkable in either Spanish or Tagalog. If my emendation is incorrect I am at a loss to explain the original *all*. The final *-i* of *allí* might drop in rapid speech before *entre*, but not in the other two instances.

01. zacate. Santos y Gómez translates this as 'grass'. Sp. *zacate* < Nahuatl *çacatl* is a term used in Mexico and Central America for grass-fodder.

52-01. ta-si suncal qui ta-si suncal. See Grammar V, 14, and VII.

01. como qui quiere visá. In Spanish the conjuction would be *como si*, or possibly *como quien*. In the same way that *na* has become a part of all compound prepositions in the contact vernaculars, so there is a tendency for *qui* to be a part of all subordinating conjunctions.

02. alguna cosa. Notice the adjective. See Grammar III, 8*b*.

02. ya mira-mirá. The progressive aspect of the verb conveyed by the reduplication is not contradicted by the perfective *ya:* 'She looked and looked'. See Grammar V, 14, and VII.

03. ya pinsa-pinsá . . . puelco. This might be a simple case of an omitted relative, when the translation would be: 'She thought that the pig wanted to tell her something'. But *cosa* has developed in Ermitaño and Caviteño the meaning of 'what', so that the translation should probably be, 'She wondered what the pig wanted to tell her', which would involve a slight change in the meaning of *pinsá*, which the reduplication adequately explains: 'thought and thought'='wondered'.

04. qu'haya. This spelling is my emendation and interpretation of Santos y Gómez's *kaya*, which he explains: '*kaya* has the force of "may" '. *Cosa qu'haya* means something like 'whatever can it be that . . .'.

07. ispirá ñga. *Ñga* is the Tagalog emphatic particle *ngâ*. 'Wait a minute!'

09. gribata. Santos y Gómez translates the word as 'dig up'. The initial explosive group precludes a Tagalog origin; and the only possible word in Spanish is *cribar*, 'sift', 'riddle', which might easily be extended to mean 'poke about'. But the voicing of the initial occlusive, and the suffix, for which there are no precedents in the contact vernaculars, are difficult. I have no more satisfactory explanation.

10. rigañao. This word must be derived from the Spanish verb *regañar*, 'to growl, snarl, scold'. Sp. *regañado* has quite a different meaning, depending on other senses of the verb *regañar*, and is applied to fruit which burst their skins, and the like. The Spanish *regaño*, a gesture of disgust or anger, may actually be a likelier source than *regañar* for the Caviteño adjective, which Santos y Gómez translates as 'angry'.

11. salvaje. The force of the Spanish word has been much weakened, and it means here no more than 'stupid'.

11. no sabe si cosa quiere. *Si cosa* is an indefinite. (Compare below *No sabe si cosa di jaci*, 'She didn't know what to do'). Translate, 'It doesn't know what it wants'.

14. tibol. Sp. *tibor*, a large Chinese or Japanese earthenware or porcelain vase, usually with two handles. This may be the meaning here, but since the word is used in Mexico to mean no more than a cup, we may suppose that its use in Caviteño does not indicate necessarily a Chinese or Japanese vase, but only a kind of large earthenware jar.

52-14. O ya mirá ele . . . oro! This might be rendered, 'And oh! she saw . . . !'

15. ispantanao. Sp. *espantado*, 'frightened' or 'amazed', with a suffix. The verb occurs elsewhere: *ya ispantaná ele.*

15. no sabe si cosa di jací. 'She did not know what to do'. Compare, above, *no sabe si cosa quiere.*

16. tarantá. We may add here a further chapter to the story of a word which, because of an extraordinary concatenation of circumstances, has had a fascinating semantic history.

The name of the Greek town of *Táras* (*Táranta*), in the south of Italy, went over into Latin as *Tarentum*, and is the modern *Taranto*.

Throughout the south of Europe is found the harmless wolf-spider *Lycosa tarantula* (formerly *Tarantula Apuliae*), known in Medieval Latin as *tarantula*, because of its commonness in the region round *Tarentum*, and in modern Italian as *tarantola*. The Spaniards knew it as the *tarántula*, and took the name to South America, where they applied it to all kinds of spiders which bear no relation to the European wolf-spider, even in superficial appearance, and in particular to the great hairy fruit-eating *Mygale*.

In the south of Italy, and especially in the area round *Taranto*, there was a very rapid, whirling dance, popular with the peasantry from the fifteenth century on, and known as the *tarantella*.

The malady now known as *chorea* (< *Chorea Sancti Viti*), and called in the Middle Ages 'St John's Dance', 'St Guy's Dance', and 'St Vitus' Dance' (this latter term was not applied to the disease at present known by that name until the seventeenth century), became epidemic in northern Europe about 1374. It was a dancing madness, probably hysterical in nature, characterized by convulsions and dancing. It started in Germany and gradually spread southwards through Europe during the fifteenth century, and reached Italy. From the fifteenth century on, as late as the seventeenth century, it remained epidemic in Apulia and the adjacent parts of Italy, and was popularly attributed to the bite of the wolf-spider. It thus became known as *tarantism* (Italian *tarantismo*).

The dancing has been variously held to be the result of the bite of the *tarantula*, and a sovereign cure for it. At any rate, the *tarantella* has popularly been associated with the *tarantula* and *tarantism*, though it seems certain that the three are unconnected except for the common origin of their names in the town of *Táras*.

In Spanish, besides the words *tarántula* and *tarantela*, we have the word *taranta*, indubitably from the same source, and used in Almería and Murcia for a fast dance rather like the *tarantella*.

In South America this word *taranta* appears in various countries, each time with a shift of meaning. In Ecuador, Costa Rica, and Argentina, it means 'sudden movement', 'caprice', and 'madness'; in Nicaragua it means 'insanity'; in Honduras it is 'confusion' or 'bewilderment'. In the Philippines the word appears in Tagalog, with dislocation of the accent, as *tarantá*, 'confusion'—there exists also *tarantado*, 'confused', 'bewildered', 'stupid', clearly derived from a Spanish verb *tarantar*, which no longer exists. Caviteño *tarantá*, 'to be confused', may be derived from the Tagalog *tarantá*, or it may be a survival of the Spanish verb.

52-18. con aquel mismo noche. 'That very night'.

18. carriá qui ya carriá. Old Spanish *carrear* or Modern Spanish *acarrear*, meaning, first, to transport in a *carro*, a cart, and then to transport by any means whatsoever. Santos y Gómez derives it from English *carry* (also ultimately from Low Latin *carricare*, via French), but there is no good reason to derive it from other than the Spanish source. For the form of the verb here see Grammar V, 14, and VII.

19. bajo casa. Note the omission of the article.

21. sopas. Tagalog *sopas* < Sp. *sopa*, 'soup'. See Grammar II, 7.

21. para pasá su hambre. *Pasar hambre* in Spanish means 'to suffer hunger'. The Caviteño clearly intends *para hacer pasar su hambre. Pasá*, therefore, is used in a causative sense.

23. puede. See Grammar V, 13*b*.

24. andá misa. It is possible that this is a misprint, and that it should be *andá na misa*, but it is more likely that the phrase is constructed on analogy with *uí misa.*

26. como todo el cualta . . . oro. Note the peculiar appositional construction which dispenses with a copula.

27. subuk. Tagalog *subuk* + *an*, 'to watch from cover', 'to test'.

27. pol pin. Sp. *por fin*, 'at last'.

28. por eso. Santos y Gómez writes this as one word, *poreso*, which is probably a more exact reflection of the psychological import of the word to a Caviteño speaker.

28. desde con aquél . . . religioso. 'Ever since then, whenever the people there talk about someone being lucky, they mention the religious old woman'.

30. mañga mal conciencia. This is a curiously laconic sentence, summing up the reactions of the relatives.

33. puro. This is not an adjective, but, by an interesting semantic development, an adverb: 'only'.

33. buen. The apocope, if this is not a misprint, is unusual.

33. arriba di casa. *Di* may here again incorporate a definite article.

37. peliz. Santos y Gómez has *felismente*, which I have emended, since neither *f* nor *-mente* are employed in the contact vernaculars.

37. ya murí. Santos y Gómez has *ya murió*, which I have emended, suspecting that in this final sentence the Spanish contamination has crept in because of the carelessness which occurs towards the end of any work.

Texts III

52-38. tamad. Tagalog *tamad*, 'lazy'.

39. tamad na tamad. This is pure Tagalog intensification of the adjective by reduplication, using the connective *na* since the adjective ends in a consonant. See Grammar III, 10*b*

40. alcabal. 'After'. See the note on *alcabal* in Text I, 55.04

40. ricugí. Sp. *recoger*. Santos y Gómez translates the word as 'clean', 'put in order', 'put out table after a meal'. I find it difficult to believe that it means anything different from Spanish *recoger*, 'to clear away dishes, etc., after a meal'.

41. jelad. Santos y Gómez translates this as 'laugh or mock at'. I assume that it is Tagalog *hilat*, which my dictionary explains as 'To rebuke or reproach jokingly with the accompaniment of drawing down the lower lids of the eyes with the tips of the fingers'.

44. pono. Tagalog *punò*, 'tree'.

44. camanchilis. Tagalog *kamatsilí* or *kamansí*, *Artocarpus communis* Forst., a species of bread-fruit.

53-02. duende. Sp. *duende*, 'elf' or 'goblin'. Santos y Gómez translates it as 'dwarf'. For 'dwarf' Tagalog uses *unano* (< Sp. *enano*) but in the Visayas Cebuano uses *dwendihon* and Ilongo *dwende* for 'dwarfish'.

02. el ojos grandeng-grande. For this construction see Grammar V, 15.

03. nanay. Tagalog *nanay*, 'mother' (vocative). Compare the Ermitaño forms *nay* and *nana*.

03. grita qui ya gritá. See Grammar V, 14, and VII.

05. y al lligando. Santos y Gómez has *yal lligando*, which I do not understand. My emendation still presents a number of difficulties, the Spanish gerundive form, a reminiscence of the construction *al*+infinitive, both of which have disappeared elsewhere in the contact vernaculars, and which cannot be combined in any case. This is, however, a nursery rhyme, and the form may have been handed down from an earlier century of less grammatical uniformity.

07. Maltín piscadol. Sp. *Martín el pescador*.

09. pito. Tagalog *pito*, 'flute' < Sp. *pito*, 'whistle'.

09. tambol. Tagalog also has *tamból* < Sp. *tambor*, 'drum', but there is in this instance no semantic variation.

13. nuyo. Tagalog *manuyó*, 'to ingratiate oneself'. Santos y Gómez translates *ta-si nuyo* as 'trying to please'.

14. lliva-llivá. Notice that there is no auxiliary verb. See Grammar V, 13*b*.

14. bucayo. Tagalog *bukayò*, a sweetmeat made of grated coconut cooked with sugar.

53-16. pamalo. Tagalog *pamalò*, 'whip'.

18. Ñol. Sp. *Señor*. The form is typically Mexican.

19. sonso. Santos y Gómez spells the word '*sonzo*' and gives the translation 'stupid'. I have been unable to trace its etymology. Portuguese *sonso* means 'sly', 'cunning'. It could be that Santos y Gómez is wrong in his spelling and his translation, and that the proverb means 'The older, the wiser'.

20. jaltao. Sp. *hartado*, 'satisfied'.

20. tasao. Sp. *tasado* < *tasar*, 'to tax', 'to ration out', 'to skimp'. *Tasado* in Caviteño means 'unsatisfied'.

21. maldito. Sp. *maldito*, 'accursed', is used in a colloquial phrase *maldito de cocer* which is applied to someone who is particularly obstinate, bad-tempered, and so on. The Academy Dictionary acknowledges only this pejorative sense, but I have heard the phrase used colloquially as an appreciative term, as one might use the American *tough*. In any case the semantic change from the Spanish word to the Caviteño 'brave', 'courageous', is not difficult to understand.

22. bueno pa . . . 'Better . . .'. See Grammar III, 10*b*.

22. cabrón. Tagalog *kabrón* < Sp. *cabrón*, 'one who consents to his wife's adultery'. In Caviteño and Tagalog it is an unspecific term of abuse.

25. ojos . . . padicí. There is an English proverb which exactly corresponds to this: 'What the eye doesn't see, the heart doesn't grieve at'.

26. nuay laman. 'No contents'. Note that there is no other way of saying simply 'no contents': one must use the verb and say 'there are no . . .' (or, by confusion with *tiene*, perhaps, 'it has no . . .).

27. dalaga. Tagalog *dalaga*, 'maiden', 'unmarried girl'.

27. guapa. See Grammar III, 8*b*.

28. si . . . hijo. This is the reverse of the English 'Like father, like son'.

CHAPTER V

ZAMBOANGUEÑO: TEXTS AND NOTES

Bibliographical Note—Texts I: Chavacano Songs
Texts II: Bantayanon Songs—Notes.

Bibliographical Note

Texts of the Zamboangueño dialect were once available in the files of *El Imparcial*, a newspaper of Zamboanga City, which ran a daily column in Chavacano; but the entire files of the paper were destroyed during the war.

The folk-songs which I print here were collected and written down for me by Mr Felipe Saavedra J., of Tetuan, Zamboanga City.

These texts should be compared with the prose samples of Chavacano collected by Howard P. McKaughan, and printed as 'Notes on Chabacano Grammar' in *The Journal of East Asiatic Studies* (University of Manila), III, 2 (January 1954), pp. 205–243. There are several important differences: the future is formed with *ay* instead of *de;* the pronominal system is complete and consistent, in the plural entirely Visayan, and observing the distinction between exclusive and inclusive in the first person; the article is used with all proper names; and it seems that Spanish fricatives are replaced by occlusives. These samples clearly represent a much 'purer' dialect—even though there are traces of Spanish contamination—than do my folk-songs—or than any Chavacano I heard spoken in Zamboanga. But Mr McKaughan's speaker was the daughter of an emigrant Zamboanga family who was born in Samar, living later in Surigao and Manila (according to the autobiographical information in the texts), and who had never been to Zamboanga. This suggests that the decay of Zamboangueño as indicated by the lack of a standard in my texts, is not much more than one generation old.

Texts I

Vida entre Espumas

El gente de ciudad
Bien bugalón,
No quiere caminá
Sino seda el pantalón;
Ni quiere comé
Si el úlam bagón,
Sino comé guisao,
Carne con camarón.
Ahora día y noche ta pasá
10 Con saging lúyat;
El pobre big shot
Hasta el camantíng —
Tanan baliscat.

Ámame por Favor

Cuando yo ya mirá vos cara,
Blanco, fresco como azucena,
Ya sentí yo un momento pena,
Que ta dale dulce dolor;
Y por eso con ansias loco,
Yo con vos ta viví cantando,
Para yo ñga sabé si cuando
Si evos conmigo tiene amor.
Jablá ya vos, con todo franqueza, Ñora,
10 Y como nagora, si puede alcanzá
El grato *sí* que evos ta dale conmigo.
Para yo viví tranquilo,
Si evos conmigo tiene amor.
Si quiere vos, Nena,
Casá kitá dos,
Mañana a las cuatro
Con el padre Oldog,
Para viví tranquilo,
Junto los dos,
20 No tené-tené disgusto,
Ni evos conmigo, ni yo con vos.

Hija Desdichada

Yo el anak desdichado del mundo,
Sin mi gusto mi amor ya entregá
Con el estraño chino comerciante
Que mi tata conmigo ya dejá.

Por el camino de juego,
Ese yo cosa pensá,
Tata y nana na vicio,
30 Con su anak ya entregá.

Yo el anak no hay más otro remedio
Sino suprí con todo el corazón,
Y alboroto kanaton ta dale,
Todo el día el murmuración.

Lo que ta jablá el reprán del maga viejo,
'El sentimiento no puede aguantá',
El corazón del mujer sin consuelo,
Desdichado mi suerte patal.

*

Na sitio de Maculong
40 Tiene tres dalaguita;
Ya casá el mayor,
Que bien triste el menor.
Ya contestá el na entre-medio:

'Ay, Manang, viví contento,
Cay mañana de este mes
Ay casá kitá todo'.

*

Mujer ingrata
Supla con carborata,
Volvé na casa,
Avisá con su tata.

*

Pobre mi anak,
Solo, solo na casa;
10 Mujer jugadora,
Tata ta trabajá.

*

Gato priñada
Mañana parí,
Llama paltera
Si Duding taquí.

Texts II

Abajo de mi ventana
Tiene un pono de limoncito,
Cada rama siete plores,
Cada plores un bisito.

20 Abajo de mi ventana
Tiene un pono de cajel,
Ya partí para comé,
Ya salí siete mujel.

Abajo de mi ventana
Tiene un pono de naranjita,
Ya partí para comé,
Ya salí siete bonita.

*

Siete palo tiene el monte,
Sambón, sampáloc, sandía,
30 Santol, sampínit, sampaga,
Hierba de Santa María.

*

María, plor de canela,
Hija de la peregrina,
Prima hermana de la luna,
Lucero de la mañana.

En el río de Jordán,
Nacieron tres maravillas,
Jesucristo de rodillas
Cuando bautizó San Juan.

*

Jala, jala, mi baroto,
Apunta na Barrigón;
Aguanta prío y sereno,
Por cugí el camarón.

*

Al pará en tu presencia,
10 Dueña de mi corazón,
Yo tengo mucho vergüenza,
Porque corto mi calzón.

*

El perico y el catarra
Estaba en un platanal,
Comiendo saging verde
Sin dejar de madurar.

*

El dalaga de Mayubu
Tiene herencia de subay,
Ya mandá jurá su novio,
20 Ya jura vida inay.

*

Ay, Mamá, no compía
El caballo maskin manso:
Porque tiene rato
Siempre ta patiá.

Notes

The first group of songs (Texts I), which Mr Saavedra called specifically Chavacano songs, have a much wider currency than the second group (Texts II), called by Mr Saavedra Bantayanon songs, which are essentially of Zamboanga City. There is no very striking difference between the language of the two groups, except that Spanish contamination is a trifle heavier in the songs from Zamboanga City.

Texts I

68-01. de. McKaughan, *loc. cit.*, notes that, in the Chavacano he recorded, 'of the' is expressed by *de* or *del.* Here again, therefore (compare the notes on Caviteño) we have an instance of incorporation of the definite article.

68-01. de ciudad. The phrase does not mean simply 'city people'. This song was written during the Japanese occupation of Zamboanga, and refers specifically to Zamboanga City: *el gente de ciudad*, 'the people from Zamboanga City'.

02. bugalón. Ilongo *bugalón*, 'proud'. (I find *bugalón* as a translation of 'proud' in the *English—Tagalog—Visayan (Ilongo—Cebuano) Vocabulary*, by Enríquez, Bautista, and Jamolangue, Manila, 1949. The translation I was offered in Zamboanga City was 'too used to comfort', 'pretentious'; while Professor López knows the word with a slight semantic variation: 'braggart'.) Note that *bien bugalón* is a Spanish method of intensification.

03. quiere. Note the inflected form of the verb.

06. úlam. Tagalog *ulam*, translated in all the dictionaries by the extraordinary word 'viand'. It may be rendered 'food', though the meaning is more specific: 'a dish', 'a course', 'an item in a meal', one particular kind of food.

06. bagón. Tagalog *bagoong*, small fishes or prawns, salted or pickled.

07. guisao, Sp. *guisado*, 'roast meat'.

08. carne. Sp. *carne*, 'meat', but the Spanish word is used in Tagalog (*karné*) as well as Ilongo and Cebuano (*karne*).

10. saging. Tagalog *saging*, 'banana'.

10. lúyat. Ilongo or Hiligaynon, the language of Iloilo, has *luyát*, 'hanging down loosely in folds or wrinkles as the skin of very old or lean persons'. I am indebted to Professor López for this explanation. The translation I obtained in Zamboanga City was 'unripe', which suggests that the Chavacano-speaker who was my informant did not understand the Ilongo word at all, and that it is not, therefore, an essential part of the Zamboangueño lexicon.

11. big shot. There is nowadays a considerable number of English words in the contact-vernacular vocabularies. The Caviteño texts I reprint antedate the main influx of English words, while Santos y Gómez may have eliminated what there were, for he notes and deplores the tendency.

12. hasta el camanting. Another *comé* must be supplied: 'The poor big shot is even reduced to eating sweet potatoes'.

12. camanting. Tagalog *kamote* (*ng*) *kahoy*, 'sweet potato'.

13. tanan baliscat. Ilongo *tanán*, 'everything', *baliskarón*, 'to reverse' 'Everything is turned upside down'. There is exceedingly heavy Ilongo contamination with this text: the proportion of Visayan words and constructions is not usually so high.

69-00. Ámame por favor. The title of this poem, which is pure Spanish, is the only piece of untypical language in this poem, which is an almost uncontaminated Chavacano.

04. dale. See the note on *dale* in the Caviteño text, 51.27.

69-07. ñga. This is the Tagalog emphatic again, giving to *sabé* the force of something like 'really know'.

07. si cuando si. I do not understand this phrase, am unable to emend it and cannot obtain any explanation.

08. evos. This unusual form does not occur in the other contact vernaculars—does not indeed occur anywhere but in this poem, where we find it four times: twice after *si*, once after *ni*, and once after *que*. There may be a phonetic explanation. At any rate I record the form as I received it. It does not occur in McKaughan's texts at all.

10. y como nagora. 'And at once'. The phrase is something analogous to the English 'as of now'.

15. casá kitá dos. This is a future, and it should perhaps be emended to *de casá* or *ay casá*. 'We two shall get married'.

15. kitá. Tagalog, Cebuano, and Ilongo *kitá*, 'we'. It is the inclusive form.

16. a las cuatro. This may be a survival of the Spanish form or a recent contamination.

19. los dos. This is Spanish contamination.

22. hija desdichada. The title is pure Spanish, but it is possible that it does not belong with the song.

23. anak. Tagalog, Cebuano, and Ilongo *anák*, 'child'.

24. ya entregá. Not 'has handed over', but 'has been handed over' or 'given away'.

28. ese yo cosa pensá. 'This is what I think'.

33. kanaton. Cebuano has *kanato*, Ilongo has (*sa*)*aton*, for the inclusive 'us'.

33. y alboroto kanaton ta dale. 'And noise they give us' (?).

36. el sentimiento no puede aguantá. Again the passive: 'The feeling cannot be borne'.

40. tiene. There is the same confusion with *hay* that we have noted in the other contact vernaculars: 'there are'.

40. dalaguita. Tagalog and Ilongo *dalagita*, 'maiden'. Tagalog and Cebuano have *dalaga* also.

42. bien triste. Compare *bien bugalón*, 68.02 above. This is a Spanish method of intensification.

70-02. cay. Cebuano *tungod kay*, *sanglit kay*, Ilongo *tungód kay*, 'because'

03. ay casá. This is the future. Throughout McKaughan's texts the future is formed with *ay*, instead of *de*, although in conversations with Zamboangueño-speakers in Zamboanga I always found *de*. Unless this *ay* be the copulative particle (which enters into the formation of every finite verb in Tagalog where there is no inversion) I am at a loss to account for it.

70-03. ay casá kitá todo. 'We shall all be married'.

04. ingrata. Note the feminine form of the adjective. There are many instances in these short poems: *jugadora*, *prinãda* (though here with justification, since it cannot occur in the masculine form in Spanish), *peregrina*, etc.

14. paltera. Sp. *partera*, 'midwife'.

15. si Duding. *Si* is the native article necessary with proper names.

Texts II

17. tiene. Again in the sense of 'there is'.

17. pono. Tagalog *punò*, 'tree'.

19. plores. Sp. *flor*. The word is singular.

19. bisito. Sp. *beso* + *ito*, 'little kiss'.

21. cajel. Sp. *naranja cajel* (or *naranja zahart*) is a grafted orange with a very rough skin. The word has been taken into Cebuano as *kahil*, where it means simply 'orange', but in this text there is clearly some difference between *cajel* and the *naranjita*, 'orange', of the following stanza.

27. bonita. The word *guapa* is not used in Chavacano: I was informed in Zamboanga that *guapa* was Visayan. Note that the feminine form of the adjective is preserved because of the frequency of its use.

29. sambón. Tagalog *sambóng*, a variety of sage, *Blumea balsamifera*.

29. sampáloc. Tagalog *sampalok*, 'tamarind'. Note that in the Visayan languages the word is *sambag*.

29. sandía. Sp. *sandía*, 'water-melon', used also in Cebuano and Ilongo (*sandiya*).

30. santol. Tagalog *santól*, *Sandoricum indicum* L., a tree with edible fruit.

30. sampínit. Ilongo has *sampinit/sapinit*, for a kind of thorn or briar.

30. sampaga. Tagalog *sampaga*, *Jasminum sambac*, Arabian jasmine.

71-05. jala. Tagalog *hala*, an exclamation of encouragement.

05. baroto. This means 'boat' in Zamboanga City, but I cannot trace its etymology.

06. Barrigón. This is a local place-name.

09. al pará. Sp. *al parar*. The same construction may be found in McKaughan's texts, but it is certainly a recent innovation due to contact with correct Spanish.

11. tengo. This is recent Spanish contamination again.

13. perico. Sp. *perico*, 'parakeet', is used in Ilongo (*periko*) and Cebuano (*piriko*) for 'parrot'.

71-13. catarra. This may be Spanish *cotorra*, a variety of lorikeet, or Tagalog *katalà*, which means the same thing, though the two words do not seem to have any etymological connection.

14. estaba. *Estaba* occurs in McKaughan's texts also.

18. tiene herencia de subay. 'She has a small inheritance'.

18. subay. Ilongo *subáy*, 'ant'.

19. ya mandá jurá su novio . . . inay. 'Her sweetheart asked her to swear, and she swore her life (mother?)'. *Inay* may be Tagalog *ináy*, 'mother'. I cannot obtain a satisfactory explanation of the second line.

21. compía. Sp. *confiar*.

22. maskin. Cebuano *maskin*, 'even'. The word occurs in McKaughan's texts where it is translated 'just'. Tagalog has *maskí*, 'even if'.

24. patiá. Sp. *patear*, 'kick'.

CHAPTER VI

THE GRAMMAR OF THE CONTACT VERNACULARS

Scheme of Analysis

Contact-Vernacular Grammar

A FEATURE of all contact vernaculars is their instability. As will be seen from the texts and the notes which accompany them, there are few rules of contact-vernacular grammar which admit of no exceptions; for all the dialects are more or less subject to the contaminating influence of standard Spanish, Tagalog or Cebuano usage. Ermitaño was affected most by Spanish; Caviteño is more exposed to Tagalog influence; while Zamboangueño is disintegrating in two directions, into two dialects, one which is little more than incorrect Spanish with some features of the contact vernacular, and the other which makes extensive use of native words and constructions. Caviteño and Zamboangueño are also subject to the influence of English, to a rather greater extent than one might imagine from the texts.

In the circumstances it is almost absurd to attempt to write a 'grammar' of the contact vernaculars, and, as will be seen, I have not, primarily, essayed to do so—even if the result is something which might well pass for a grammar of these languages. Essentially I have concerned myself only with the treatment of Spanish flexions in the contact vernaculars. This, of course, covers the articles, the noun, the personal pronouns and possessives, adjective and adverb (since the two are identical in form in these dialects), the verb and the preposition, because of the regular deformation of the pattern of Spanish prepositions.

This is a study of the metamorphosis of Spanish flexional forms in the contact vernaculars, of the morphology of the principal parts of speech. Necessarily this has involved a certain number of references to the syntax of the contact vernaculars, but I have not tried to exhaust the complex subject of syntax.

The terminology employed in the ensuing paragraphs is, in general, that of Indo-European grammar, with its parts of speech, tense, number, gender and so on, for the contact vernaculars are clearly Spanish rather than Tagalog. But the impression this procedure may leave should be corrected by the analyses which follow each section, and by the *General Conclusions*, which I believe, establish correctly the psychology of these contact vernaculars and offer suggestions for a new approach to the whole subject of these marginal tongues.

Finally, it should be noted that I have drawn most of my examples from the texts, so that the reader may, if he will, study them in context;

but it was not always possible to find apposite examples, and other illustrations, especially for Zamboangueño, have been drawn from my notes of conversations with speakers of these dialects.

I. The Definite and Indefinite Articles

IA. *The Definite Article*

1. The definite article in all three dialects is *el*. It is never inflected in any way, and is used for Spanish *el*, *la*, *los*, and *las*.

Ermitaño: *el viento; el luna; el ojos; el escamas*, etc.
Caviteño: *el vieja*, *el cumida*, etc.
Zamboangueño: *el gente*, *el murmuración*, etc.

(i) I might also add that *el* is the only possible equivalent for Spanish *lo* with an adjective, except that I have found no instance of any construction in the contact vernaculars which exactly parallels Sp. *lo bueno* and *lo malo*. *El sucio del pescao* (Ermitaño) is an instance of the substantivization of an adjective, but it is a concrete, not an abstract, conception.

(ii) In Zamboangueño there are, of course, several instances of inflexion of the definite article: *todos los días*, *las cuatro*, *los dos*, etc., due to contamination by contact with correct Spanish.

1b. As in Spanish, the definite article combines with the preposition *de* to form *del*.

Ermitaño: *del mirada del viejo*, *debajo del olas*, etc.
Caviteño: *demonio del bolsa*, *arriba del pono*, etc.
Zamboangueño: *del mundo*, *del mujel*, etc.

(i) There is no corresponding contraction of *el* with *a* (Sp. *al*), since the preposition *a* is not used in the contact vernaculars. In only a very few instances have *a* and *al* been replaced by contact with correct Spanish, though McKaughan finds the construction *al* + infinitive often enough in his speaker to account it a regular 'adverbial constitute' of Chavacano.

(ii) In Caviteño there are several examples of what we may take to be either the omission of the definite article after *de*, or the incorporation of the article in the preposition, on the model of the inflected article in Tagalog: *la hora di cumida*, *di Ñora Culasa*, *el cumida di puelco*, *arriba di casa*, etc. McKaughan notes that *de* may stand for 'of the' in Chavacano.

In Tagalog the definite articles (*si* for proper nouns, *ang* for common nouns) are inflected in respect of number and four syntactical relationships. The 'attributive' case corresponds to most Spanish uses of *de* with the definite article, so that Tagalog-speakers unsure of Spanish or contact-vernacular usage would tend to prefer the attributive *de* to an uncharacterized definite article, and being unaccustomed to employing two particles in this context might even imagine that the Spanish *de* were the attributive case of the article. If this were the speakers' intention

it would be untrue to say that the definite article is sometimes omitted after *de* in Caviteño, and to a lesser degree in the other contact vernaculars, even though it would be equally misleading to assert that *de* is the attributive case of an inflected contact-vernacular article. See the analysis below.

(iii) Zamboangueño, because of Spanish contamination, has forms like *de la*, *de los*, and *de las*.

2. The preposition *na* usurps, like *di* in Caviteño, part of the function of the definite article, so that the definite article is always omitted, in all three dialects, after *na*.

Ermitaño: *na pondo del mar*, *na olas y na cielos*, *na ventana abierta*, *na cara del mujel*, etc.
Caviteño: *na provincia di Cavite*, *na sulal*, etc.
Zamboangueño: *na casa*, *na mesa*, *andá na mercado*, etc.
See the analysis below.

2b. There is one example in the texts of the use of the definite article with a possessive.

Ermitaño: *el nisós honra.*

This isolated example in the texts, though it does occur also in the spoken languages, is completely inconclusive.

(i) The use of the definite article with the possessive is a feature of the western dialects of the Iberian Peninsula: Portuguese, Galician, Leonese, and the *bable* of Asturias. But it is not possible to attribute a parallel example of such a phenomenon in a contact vernacular to the influence of a dialect of the parent tongue, for a dialectal peculiarity indicates no more than a slightly different psychological approach to the same syntactical problem.

(ii) Tagalog sometimes uses the definite article with a possessive. Thus 'This is their house' does not require an article, but 'Their house is big' does: *Ang kanilàng bahay ay malakí* (literally, 'The their house is big').

(iii) That there is a psychological difference between a possessive and an ordinary attributive adjective is demonstrated by the fact that English, French, Spanish, etc., consistently use the definite article with the one and do not use it with the other. But other languages—Portuguese, Leonese, Tagalog at times—fail to observe any distinction. The use of the definite article with a possessive could scarcely arise by analogy with its use with an ordinary adjective. But its occurrence in the contact vernaculars is so infrequent that it is difficult to know to what source to attribute it.

IB. *The Indefinite Article*

3. The indefinite article in the contact vernaculars is *un*. Like the definite article it is invariable, and entirely replaces the Spanish feminine form *una*.

Examples: *un mujel, un plor, un ola, un dalaga.*

(i) The form without apocope, *uno*, is still used pronominally, as in Spanish, and in counting: *uno, dos tres; uno, uno, ocho campanadas.*

(ii) *Un* is never used where Spanish would use *unos* or *unas*, 'some'. The contact vernaculars entirely omit the pluralized indefinite article, even though *um* in Indo-Portuguese serves for singular and plural.

4. The indefinite article is not, as the definite article is, omitted after *na.* Example: *na un puelte aguacero de rosas.*

4*b*. It is, however, sometimes omitted in comparisons.
Ermitaño: *como pájaro; el luna ta ilumina Ermita como parol.*
But note: *muelto como un pájaro.*

4*c*. For the use of the indefinite article with an apparently plural noun, see below II, 7.

Examples: *un lágrimas, un céntimos, un estrellas.*

Summary Analysis

This description of the grammar of the contact vernaculars is based, essentially, on Spanish. If, however, one were to take Tagalog grammar as a basis it would be possible to write a rather different account. One might, for instance, say that the definite article has only three of the four Tagalog cases.

	TAGALOG		CONTACT VERNACULARS	
	Singular	*Plural*	*Singular*	*Plural*
Nominative	ang	ang mga	el	el (mana/mañga)
Attributive	ng	ng mga	de/di/del	del (mana/mañga)
Locative	sa	sa mga	na	na (mana/mañga)
Appositional	na	na	—	—

This would, clearly, be a misrepresentation of the grammar of the contact vernaculars. It is essentially Spanish, much simplified; but it is important to realize that the grammar of the substratum language has contributed something to the psychology of the contact-vernacular grammar. Ermitaño and the other dialects have, in effect, discarded the number and gender of the Spanish article, while retaining the form, *el*, and have discarded the forms of the Tagalog article (with the exception of the plural particle, see below II, 6), while retaining something of its psychology.

II. The Noun

5. The noun in the contact vernaculars is inflected in respect of number only, and has no gender.

(i) It is obvious that the gender of a noun can be determined only by the behaviour of other parts of speech to which it may be syntactically related: in Spanish by the use of the pronoun, *él* or *ella*, by the use of the definite article, *el* or *la*, and by the form of the predicative or attributive adjective. The pronoun, the article, and the adjective are all

invariable in the contact vernaculars. Instances of what appears to be a feminine adjective are discussed below, III, 8b.

(ii) Grammatical gender is a feature of only a very few language-groups (Indo-European, Semitic, Hamitic, and some Amerindian languages). Its absence in the contact vernaculars must be connected with its non-existence in the substratum languages.

5*b*. The contact vernaculars do show at times examples of the feminine form of nouns which have in Spanish both masculine and feminine forms depending on the sex of the person to whom they refer.

Examples: *viejo, vieja; hijo, hija; muchacho, muchacha; ladrón, ladrona; soltero, soltera.*

(i) These double forms are preserved in order to make distinctions which we make in English (a) by using different words: *son, daughter; boy, girl; bachelor, spinster;* (b) by adding 'man' or 'woman': *old man, old woman;* or (c) which we do not observe at all: *thief.* They are none of them distinctions of grammatical gender but of sex.

(ii) In Tagalog, though grammatical gender is entirely lacking, the natural sex of a noun, i.e. male or female, is sometimes indicated by the use of *lalaki* or *babae* in apposition with the noun. The sex of animals is distinguished in the same way, so that a gander is *gansang-lalaki* while a goose is *gansang-babae.* There is another word used to indicate animal mothers, *inahin*, and we find one example of the use of this device in the Caviteño texts: *puelco inajin.*

(ii) The possibility of the differentiation of sexes is essential. The contact vernaculars could not have discarded the Spanish distinctions of sex—in many cases they did not—if they did not have the means of re-establishing the distinction where necessary, and the fact that the only means they had was the comparatively clumsy Tagalog and Spanish methods of using *lalaki* and *babae*, *macho* and *hembra*, is doubtless the reason why the Spanish flexion has been preserved in so many instances to indicate sex distinctions.

(iv) The Spanish feminine termination *-a* has survived in the contact vernaculars; but it is not a living form. It is not now possible to form an entirely new feminine from an Ermitaño noun by adding *-a*, as is possible with neologisms in Spanish.

6. The plural of the contact-vernacular noun may be formed in two ways, may combine both methods, or may have no inflexion at all.

a. Plurals in *-s.* The plural may be formed, as in Spanish, by the addition of *-s* or *-es.*

Examples: *rosa, rosas; dolor, dolores.*

b. Plurals with *mana.* The plural may be formed as in Tagalog, by anteponing the plural particle *mana* or *mañga* (Tagalog *mangá* or *mga*).

Ermitaño: *su mana compañera, el mana estrella, el mana dolor;*
Caviteño: *el mañga puelco, el mañga vicino, el mañga pariente;*
Zamboangueño: *el mana mesa, el mana libro.*

c. Plurals with *mana* and *-s*.

Ermitaño: *su mana marejadas, el mana ojos, el mana palabras;*
Caviteño: *el mañga vicinos.*

d. Uninflected plurals. The number of the contact-vernacular noun is sometimes not indicated at all, and we know only from the context that more than one is intended.

Caviteño: *el cangrejo, el puelco.*

This is very frequent in Zamboangueño also, although there are no clear examples in the texts.

e. With numerals it is usual for the noun to show no inflection at all in Caviteño and Zamboangueño.

Caviteño: *tres hora, dos tibol;*
Zamboangueño: *siete bonita, siete mujel, siete palo, tres dalaguita.*
(But contrast Ermitaño: *ocho campanadas*).

There is in each language a certain amount of confusion in the use of plural flexions; but nevertheless certain distinctions can be made between the habits of the three vernaculars. We may represent these differences schematically thus:

Mana and *-s*	*-s*	*mana*	——
Ermitaño	Ermitaño	Ermitaño	
	Caviteño	Caviteño	Caviteño
		Zamboangueño	Zamboangueño

Ermitaño never fails to indicate the plural, to the extent of sometimes employing both Spanish and Tagalog methods at the same time, while Zamboangueño sometimes dispenses with the indication of plural number altogether, and never makes use of the Spanish method (in the texts there is only one example: *nacieron tres maravillas*, a very clear case of Spanish contamination).

7. There exist in Ermitaño and Caviteño a number of seeming plurals which should, logically, be singular. In the Ermitaño text we have, for instance, a number of cases of the use of the indefinite article with an apparently plural noun.

Ermitaño: *ya meté un granos de arena na mi ojos; más purioso que un olas; ya saltá un lágrimas na su ojos; ta caé un estrellas na olas.*

Caviteño: *ni un céntimos qui gastá.*

Zamboangueño: *Cada plores.*

In addition there are a number of cases of the use of a 'plural' where, in Spanish, we should expect to find a singular.

Ermitaño: *todo el ropas tirao; el campanas del iglesia ya soná ocho campanadas; ya podé recordá su sueños; el llantos; el marejadas.*

Caviteño has *sopas*.

All the examples in the first group are certainly to be understood as singular, and those of the second group are probably in the same case.

(i) There are various possible explanations.

a. Some of the words are most frequently used in the plural form: *ojos, granos, lágrimas, olas*, etc., so that if a distinction were lost it would be the plural form which would be most likely to survive.

b. There is no indefinite article in Tagalog, and hence no way of indicating number in nouns which do not have either a definite article or an adjective, both of which make use of the plural particle *mangá*. This occasional failure to mark the number of Tagalog substantives may have led to some confusion in the contact vernaculars.

c. There are sporadic examples in Peninsular and American Spanish of the use of a plural for a singular: Old Sp. and American *las casas* for *la casa, las barbas* against *la barba*, and a whole host of plurals standing for objects which would be rendered by a singular in English: *los çampos, las aguas del mar, las carnes, las sombras*, etc. However all these Spanish plurals (except, perhaps, *las casas*) are explicable, whereas *un olas*, or any case of the plural with the singular indefinite article, is not. Nevertheless the Spanish use of plurals where Tagalog used a 'singular' may have contributed to the confusion.

(ii) Without attempting to specify the detailed reasons for the occurrence of this phenomenon, there is no doubt whatsoever that the failure to employ correctly the Spanish plural flexion is due to the Tagalog substratum. Tagalog, itself, borrowing words from Spanish, has often chosen the plural form—in some cases where we may imagine that they heard the word most often with the plural flexion, but in others where they probably never heard a Spanish plural of the word, and tacked on a gratuitous *-s* simply by analogy with other words: *sopas* < Sp. *sopa; kastanyas, mansanas, peras, ubas, letsugas*, etc. (all these are the Spanish plural forms of fruit or vegetables, no doubt most often referred to in the plural); *perlas, botones* (small objects again most often mentioned in the plural); *oras, medyas, balbas*, etc.

Zamboangueño, which does not use the Spanish *-s*, has *plores* (Sp. *flor, flores*) for both the singular and the plural of 'flower'; while I have been unable to find a genuine Ermitaño singular *ojo* for the word *ojos*, which seems to be both singular and plural.

The ultimate reason for the appearance of these peculiar forms in the contact vernaculars may be a little difficult to explain satisfactorily, but they are certainly the same as those which account for the appearance of *medyas* meaning '*one* stocking' and *botones* meaning '*one* button' in Tagalog. In other words the psychology of the contact vernaculars is again very similar to the psychology of Tagalog.

Summary Analysis

There is no grammatical gender in the contact vernaculars, as there is none in Tagalog; but Spanish sex-distinctions which depend on the final vowel, *-o* or *-a*, in pairs of words like *hermano, hermana; soltero; viejo; compañero*, etc., have been retained partly, perhaps, because there is only a very clumsy Tagalog method of reestablishing the distinction when it is required.

There is a certain amount of confusion in all three dialects with regard to the formation of the plural. All three use Spanish plural forms as plurals and singulars indifferently, a phenomenon which is undoubtedly connected with a similar confusion evident in Spanish loan-words in Tagalog. The Tagalog plural particle is employed in all three to form the plural, while, in addition, the Spanish method is used in Ermitaño, and, to a lesser extent in Caviteño also.

It is difficult to be certain of what the primitive usage was, but we may be fairly sure that there was no entirely regular or uniform practice in Ternateño, or the early forms of the Ermitaño and Caviteño dialects. Ermitaño, growing up in the vicinity of Intramuros, made rather more extensive use of Spanish forms, to a degree which might lead one to suppose at times that *mana* is a kind of emphatic used alongside the Spanish flexion. Caviteño, in Tagalog territory, with a much larger percentage of pure Tagalog words in its vocabulary than Ermitaño, seems to prefer the Tagalog method of forming the plural with *mañga*—note too that Caviteño ['maŋa] is nearer to Tagalog [ma'ŋa] than Ermitaño ['mana]. It appears that the Spanish flexion *survives* in Caviteño. While in Zamboanga, the Spanish flexion has been entirely eliminated in certain forms of the dialect, while in those forms most affected by Spanish contamination it entirely replaces *mana*.

It would seem, in general, that both Tagalog and Spanish methods of forming the plural are employed in the contact vernaculars, the proportionate importance of each method within the dialect depending on the degree of Spanish or Tagalog influence (measurable by other criteria, such as vocabulary).

III. The Adjective and the Adverb

8. The adjective in the contact vernaculars is invariable, and is not inflected in respect of gender, which does not exist in these languages, or of number.

Examples: *el vieja religioso, mañga puelco chiquitito.*

Apocope of the adjective may take place, but not with the same regularity as in Spanish: *un buen cumida*, but *un grande mesa.*

8*b*. In general it is the masculine singular form of the Spanish adjective which is used in the contact vernaculars, but there are a few cases in which the feminine form is employed.

(i) In certain set phrases the adjective retains its Spanish form. Examples: *el Vilgen Santísima, media noche.*

(ii) The vast majority of the cases in which the feminine form of the adjective is used indicate merely that the feminine form is much more commonly used than the masculine in Spanish. This applies to all the words below.

Examples: *guapa, bonita, nerviosa, preñada, desgraciada, grandísima.*

In the case of *desgraciada* and *grandísima* it must be understood that these words are no longer euphemisms, and can be applied only to women.

(iii) Other sporadic cases occur in the texts:

Ermitaño: *más puriosa que un olas;* Caviteño: *alguna cosa.*

These are in all probability errors on the part of the transcribers and if not are merely examples of Spanish contamination. The effects of the second contact with correct Spanish in Zamboangueño are sometimes rather curious: *aquellas mana mesa largo*, but such sporadic instances need not detain us here.

8*c*. The only adjective ever inflected in respect of number is the possessive, and that only in Ermitaño.

Examples: *mis pies, mis ojos, sus piernas.*

See below IV, 12.

9. The adverb in the contact vernaculars has the same form as the corresponding adjective.

Examples: *caminá chiquitito, examiná bueno con ele, clavá bueno el vista, caminá poco-poco.*

(i) This procedure necessarily involves, at times, some slight semantic change: *puro* (Caviteño) has come to mean 'only', which is not quite the same as *puramente* in Spanish; *chiquitito* in the example above, for which there is no equivalent adverbial form in Spanish, must be translated as 'with small steps'.

(ii) The adverbialized adjective is used in South American Spanish, though not, of course, to the same extent as in the contact vernaculars: *lento* for *lentamente*, and so on. Though this is clearly not the reason for the identification of adverbs and adjectives in the contact vernaculars, it does indicate that there would be a readiness on the part of the native Spanish-speakers involved in the genesis of these languages to accept the adverbialized adjective without attempting to correct it.

(iii) There are a great many languages which do not distinguish between adjectives and adverbs, even within the Indo-European group, and vulgar English speech also fails to make the distinction, which means that the traditional division of adverb and adjective is largely a question of formal grammar. The confusion of the two is inevitably one of the first simplifications that speakers of any Malayan language would make.

9*b*. There are, of course, a number of Spanish adverbs surviving which have no equivalent adjectival forms. These are used as in Spanish.

Examples: *agora, ansina, luego, sólo, despacio, no más.*

(i) There are no instances of the adjectivization of adverbs.

(ii) The occasional form in *-mente* which appears in the texts is due to Spanish contamination.

(iii) There are no irregular adverbs in the contact vernaculars. *Bien* is entirely replaced by *bueno.*

10. Intensification of the adjective and adverb. The Indo-European grammatical terminology relating to the 'comparison' of the adjective and adverb is meaningless in Tagalog and the contact vernaculars. The different ideas conveyed in Spanish by the use of *muy*, 'very', *demasiado*, 'too much', the suffix *-ísimo*, 'very', and the superlative *el más—*, 'the most—' are not distinguished in the contact vernaculars, which have only a series of devices to convey that the adjective or adverb is 'intensified'.

a. Simple reduplication of the adjective.

Examples:

Ermitaño: *ya mirá bueno-bueno con ele; caminá poco-poco;* Caviteño: *bueno-bueno;* Zamboangueño: *qué grande-grande gayod! dulce-dulce,* etc.

b. Reduplication with a connective.

Examples:

Ermitaño: *puelteng-puelte, despaciong-despacio, altong-alto, buenong-bueno;* Caviteño: *buenung-bueno, timpranung-timprano, tristing-triste, dulcing-dulce.*

(i) This connective is Tagalog, used when the adjective ends is a vowel, as, of course, most Spanish adjectives do. When a Spanish adjective ends in a consonant and is intensified by reduplication, this is usually done without the assistance of any connective: *pácil-pácil;* but there is in the Caviteño texts an example of a Tagalog adjective, *tamad*, intensified as *tamad-na-tamad*, which uses the Tagalog connective *na* appropriate for Tagalog adjectives ending in a consonant.

(ii) Zamboangueño does not make any use of the Tagalog connective, and uses either simple reduplication or *demasiado.*

(iii) Santos y Gómez endeavours to draw a distinction between the use and non-use of the connective, claiming that the Caviteño adjective which uses the connective is a superlative, while simple reduplication indicates no more than 'very'. He observes no such distinction in the adverb. There is, in fact, no difference between adjective and adverb, or between reduplication with and reduplication without a connective.

c. A third method of intensification is the use of *masiao* (Ermitaño), *dimasiado* (Caviteño) or *demasiado* (Zamboangueño).

Examples:

Ermitaño: *con nisós masiao malo el boca;* Caviteño: *este vieja dimasiado religioso;* Zamboangueño: *demasiado chiquitito.*

(i) The contact vernaculars make no distinction between 'too' and 'very' or between 'too much' and 'very much'. The reason for this failure to distinguish between the two concepts is undoubtedly due to the psychology of the Malayan languages, which also fail to make the distinction.

(ii) There are sporadic examples of the Spanish intensitive in *-ísimo* in all the contact vernaculars, some of them due to recent contamination, but others surviving, it would seem, from the primitive period, like *santísima* and *grandísima.* This suffix is not, however, a living form in any of them.

10*b*. Pure comparison is conveyed in these dialects as in Spanish by using *más . . . que.*

Caviteño also makes use of a form adapted from Tagalog, using the Tagalog particle *pa.*

Examples: *bueno pa talde qui nunca; bueno pa este mañga puelco.*

All irregular forms of the comparative adjective, like *mejor*, *peor*, and so on, have been eliminated from the contact vernaculars.

Summary Analysis

In the contact vernaculars all the Spanish flexions of the adjective-adverb have been lost: the plural suffix *-s* for use with plural nouns, the feminine termination *-a* for use with feminine nouns, the suffix *-mente* used in Spanish when the adjective is employed adverbially, the intensitive suffix *-ísimo*, and all the irregular forms, of comparison like *mejor* and *peor*, and for adverbial use like *bien.* The Spanish adjective and adverb have been reduced, in fact, to what would be known in Tagalog as the 'word-base', which in most cases (*guapa* is one exception) happens to coincide with the form of the Spanish masculine singular of the adjective.

The only flexion admitted is the Tagalog device of reduplication with a connective to indicate intensification.

There is one other flexion which I have dealt with above, Ia, 1, and II, 6. Strictly the noun has no plural in Tagalog, and it is the plural particle *mangá* attached to the definite article and adjective which determines its number.

IV. The Personal Pronoun and the Possessives

11. Forms of the personal pronoun.

a. Ermitaño		*Nominative*	*Oblique*
	Singular	1 yo	conmigo
		2 tú	contigo
		vos	con vos
		3 ele	con ele
	Plural	1 nisós	con nisós
		2 ustedes	con ustedes
		3 ilós	con ilós

b. Caviteño		*Nominative*	*Oblique*
Singular	1	yo	conmigo
	2	vos	con vos
	3	ele	con ele
Plural	1	nisós	con nisós
	2	vusós	con vusós
	3	ilós	con ilós

c. Zamboangueño			
Singular	1	yo	conmigo
	2	tú	contigo
		vos	con vos
	3	ele	con ele
Plural	1		
inclusive		kitá	kanaton
exclusive		kamí	kanamon
	2	kamó	kaniño
	3	silá	kanila

(i) In Zamboangueño, except for the 1st and 2nd persons singular, and the 3rd person singular where *siyá* (which does not appear in McKaughan's table) alternates with *ele*, all the personal pronouns are Visayan. Although many of the forms are common to several languages the main source seems to be Cebuano. *Kanilá* is strictly a possessive, while the dative is *sa kanilá*, but Zamboangueño has *dale ese kanila* (with dislocation of the accent) alongside regular Visayan forms. There is, in fact, no strict contact-vernacular usage, but only degrees of correction approximating to pure Cebuano.

There is only one regular simplification of the native scheme, and that is the use of *kitá*, in Tagalog and the Visayan languages a dual inclusive, as a plural inclusive. The plural inclusive (*tayo* in Tagalog) is not used in Zamboangueño.

(ii) The 2nd person pronouns are rather more complicated than the schemes above might suggest. Their use is discussed more fully in 11*b* below.

(iii) *Ele*, the common gender 3rd person pronoun used in all three dialects corresponds to the Tagalog and Visayan *siyá* in its failure to distinguish the sex of the person. Most languages outside the Indo-European group fail to make this distinction. Ambiguity can be avoided only by using a noun in apposition with the pronoun, as in Ermitaño *ele, Pelisa. . . .*

(iv) There is no pronominal accusative in the Philippine languages, which admit a dative only. This practice seems to have been partly confused with the Spanish use of *a* with the personal accusative. *Con* is used to form the oblique case of every pronoun, whether it is an accusative or a dative: compare *Dale ese conmigo*, 'Give this to me', *Porqué ta jablá con ele?* 'Why are you talking with (or 'to') him?' and *Ya cucí con ele*, 'He cooked it'. The contact vernaculars regularly use *con* where Spanish would use the personal *a*.

(v) Despite the simplification of the Spanish verb forms, so that they no longer indicate in the contact vernaculars the pronominal agent, the personal pronouns are omitted in the contact vernaculars almost as often as in Spanish. The context is usually sufficient to dispel ambiguity.

11*b*. The forms of the 2nd person. A peak of instability in all three vernaculars is reached with the pronouns of the 2nd person. *Tú*, *vos*, *usted*, and derivatives of *vosotros* are all used almost indiscriminately and there is no established norm in any of the three dialects.

(i) Ermitaño. It seems probable that the most authentic contact-vernacular form is *vos*, and in *Na Maldito Arena* it is the form used by Pelisa to God, by Simón to the fishwife, by the priest to Pelisa, and by the unborn baby to its mother. In Peninsular Spanish the development of *usted* < *vuestra merced* in the seventeenth century brought *tú* back into use as the pronoun of familiar use, but *vos*, *tú*, and *usted* are used without distinction of politeness or familiarity in the contact vernaculars. Simón addresses Pelisa as *tú*, while Pelisa addresses the sea, and the fishwife addresses Simón as *usted*.

Usted has the oblique form *con usted*, while the plural *ustedes* is the only 2nd person plural now possible.

(ii) Caviteño. Caviteño usage is slightly more regular than Ermitaño, with its singular *vos* and plural *vusós* < *vosotros*. The singular however, has also the oblique form *contigo*, even though *tú* is rarely used.

(iii) Zamboangueño. The second person singular pronoun is again *vos*—though *tú* does occur—while the plural is borrowed from the Visayan languages. There is a great deal of Spanish contamination and much resultant confusion, so that *tú*, *vos*, and *usted* with their oblique forms *contigo*, *con vos*, and *con usted* are used almost indiscriminately.

Examples: *dónde ba ya tú vení? ya mirá ya vos; ta pedí yo contigo andá na mercado.*

For the reasons for this confusion see the *Summary Analysis* below.

12. Forms of the possessive adjective.

a. Ermitaño		*Singular and Plural*	*Plural*
Singular	1	mi	mis
	2	tu	tus
		vos	
	3	su	sus
Plural	1	nisós	
	2	ustedes	
	3	ilós	

b. Caviteño		
Singular	1	mi
	2	vos
	3	su
Plural	1	nisós
	2	vusós
	3	ilós

c. Zamboangueño		*Singular and Plural*
Singular	1	mi
	2	vos
	3	su

(i) For an alternative method of forming the possessive see 12*b* below.

(ii) *Usted*, used in Ermitaño, has the possessive *usted: usted hija.*

(iii) In Ermitaño and Zamboangueño there appear such forms as *mío* and *nuestro*, in Zamboangueño because of Spanish contamination, but in Ermitaño sometimes because of the survival of a formula, like *Señor Dios mío*, *Dios nuestro Señor*, and so on. Caviteño also has *Dios mío.*

(iv) In Zamboangueño, apart from the forms listed in 12*b*, the plural possessives are all borrowed from Cebuano.

(v) The Spanish plural forms *mis*, *tus*, and *sus* are found in Ermitaño: *mis pielnas*, *sus ojos*, etc., perhaps because of Spanish contamination, or perhaps because they have survived from the primitive period. These plurals are always found with words which are much less commonly used in the singular, like *ojos*, *orejas*, *pies*, *piernas*, etc.

12*b*. There is an alternative method of forming the possessive found in all three dialects: the personal pronoun is used with *de.*

Examples: *el amor de ele*, *el ojos de ele*, *esclava de vos*, *el pensamiento de ilós*, *el hijo de ustedes*, etc.

McKaughan lists some curious forms for Zamboangueño: *dimio*, *mío*, *mi; dituyo*, *tuyo*, *tu*, *debos; disuya*, *suyo*, *su.* The form *de mío* at least occurs in Ermitaño (*pol causa de mío*). Apart from this, I suspect that the construction of *de* + pronoun cannot be used with the first or second person singular. Enquiry elicited first the phrase *es a mí*, which is pure Spanish, and then, after consideration, a dubious *es de yo*, which is still impossible, since *es* is not used in the contact vernaculars.

12*c*. There are no possessive pronouns in the contact vernaculars. The only possible method is that in 12*b* above, or a circumlocution, like *ta pertenecé conmigo*, 'it belongs to me' = 'it is mine'.

Summary Analysis

The confusion with regard to the pronouns of the second person is not confined to the contact vernaculars. When *vos* passed from a plural to a polite singular, and then to a familiar singular in Spanish, *vosotros* came into use as the familiar plural pronoun, but only in Spain. In the south of Spain, in the Canary Islands, and in almost the whole of South America, the familiar plural is *ustedes*, which is used even when addressing dogs. The three Philippine dialects have adopted three different solutions to the problem. Ermitaño, like American Spanish uses *ustedes;* Caviteño, like Castilian Spanish uses *vusós* < *vosotros;* while Zamboangueño has turned to the native Philippine languages for a plural.

The confusion between *tú* and *vos* in Ermitaño and Caviteño, where *contigo* is the oblique case of *vos*, is also to be found in Spanish America.

The verb-forms corresponding with *vos* are used with the pronoun *tú* and *vice versa*, while one even finds such anomalies as *vos te volvés.* The struggle between *tú* and *vos* is still going on in the areas between the *vos* of Guatemala and Honduras and the *tú* of Peru, and between the *tú* of Peru and the *vos* of Argentina, that is to say in Costa Rica, Panamá, Venezuela, Colombia, and Ecuador, and in Chile, Bolivia, and southern Peru. It is not surprising to find in the Philippines, therefore, the same confusion.

The Spanish flexions have again been considerably simplified, to the extent that *nisós* replaces *nosotros*, *nos*, and *nuestro*, while *ilós* replaces *ellos*, *ellas*, *los*, *las*, *les*, *su*, and *sus.* Except in Zamboangueño there is no good reason for supposing that the psychology of the Tagalog pronoun has influenced this simplification other than in the reduction of *él* and *ella*, and *ellos* and *ellas* to the common-gender *ele* and *ilós.*

V. The Verb

13. In general the contact-vernacular verb consists of a 'word-base' derived from the Spanish infinitive which is modified by three particles to form the three modes. There is some contamination in all the texts, and especially in Zamboangueño, but as a general rule no Spanish flexion survives in these languages.

13*b*. One or two common verbs survive in their Spanish inflected forms, and are often employed without the auxiliary particles.

(i) *Hay.* The Spanish auxiliary verb *haber* has entirely disappeared from the contact vernaculars, and survives only in the form *hay*, in Spanish 'there is' or 'there are', but in the contact vernaculars having the additional meaning of 'have'.

(ii) *Tiene*, the third person singular of Sp. *tener* is found in all three dialects, but never in the sense of 'have', which must be rendered by *ta tené.* It means the same as Sp. *hay*, 'there is' or 'there are' (or 'there was').

> The confusion of *hay* and *tiene* in the contact vernaculars is curiously suggestive, but I cannot be certain of the correct explanation. I fancy that *hay* has developed the meaning of 'to have' simply by analogy with *tiene*, which would have, originally, both meanings, while *tiene* has developed the meaning of 'there is' by exactly the same semantic process by which *hay*, French *il y a*, and Portuguese *há* have come to mean 'there is'—or rather in the same way that Vulgar Latin *habet* came to mean 'there is'.

(iii) *Quiere*, *sabe*, and *puede* are all used in all three dialects, without any semantic distinction, alongside, respectively, *ta queré*, *ta sabé*, and *ta podé.* The inflected forms—there is not strictly any inflexion with *sabe*, but the accent falls on the stem—have survived from the earliest contact, and are not due to recent contamination.

There are sporadic instances of the use of a verb without any auxiliary in all three dialects, and especially when it suffers reduplication. The phenomenon is, however, rare, and with the exception of the verbs listed above, and *dale*, which may also be used with an auxiliary, there is reason to suspect Spanish contamination. Zamboangueño, for instance, has *dónde vos andá* alongside *dónde vos ta andá*.

13*c*. The reduction of Spanish flexions means that in the contact vernaculars there is no reflexive, no passive, no distinction between transitive and intransitive, no gerundive (corresponding to the English present participle), and that the past participle is used only adjectivally.

As a corollary the verb has suffered a number of semantic extensions, and most are capable of being used in a causative sense.

14. The contact-vernacular verb is conjugated with the aid of three particles, *ta*, *ya*, and *de* (with the alternative *ay* in Zamboangueño), which have usually been explained as present, past, and future particles. In fact, though *ta*, *ya*, and *de* would usually be translated into an Indo-European language by means of present, past, or future tenses, this explanation is only an approximation to the truth.

Ta indicates present tense, but it is also the only way of indicating the progressive, so that *ta sumí el sol* means 'the sun is setting' or 'the sun was setting'. *Ya* is the perfective particle, and is used to convey completed action. *De* (or *ay*) is used for the future, but also to indicate intention, and is often employed where Spanish would use the subjunctive.

In other words, the aspects of the contact-vernacular verb are three in number. They may be divided into the *contingent mode* (the future, the subjunctive, the intentional, the unreal or imaginary) expressed by the particles *de* or *ay*, and the *actual mode* (the indicative, the factual, the real), which may be further subdivided into the *durative aspect* (the present, the progressive, the uncompleted) expressed by *ta*, and the *punctual aspect* (the perfective, the completed, the past) expressed by *ya*.

I have borrowed this terminology from Dr Cecilio López's account of the Tagalog verb (*op. cit.*, pp. 92–93). Although these particles are Spanish (or Portuguese) and not Tagalog, and Tagalog forms its modes in quite different ways, it is abundantly clear that the conjugation of the contact-vernacular verb has nothing to do with our Indo-European past, present, and future, but is psychologically identical with that of the Tagalog verb.

ACTUAL	Durative . . .	*ta*
	Punctual . . .	*ya*
CONTINGENT		*de*

Santos y Gómez (*op. cit.*) has attempted to analyse the conjugation of the Caviteño verb into a series of tenses: present, present progressive, past, future, present perfect, past perfect, and future perfect. This analysis is totally incorrect. He derives his 'present progressive' from an intensitive reduplication which is possible with *ta*, *ya*, or *de*, and his 'present perfect', 'past perfect' and 'future perfect' tenses all depend on the use of the verb *cabá*, Sp. *acabar*, 'finish', which, in all the examples he cites, is used exactly as it would be in Spanish. Furthermore, there are no true 'tenses' in any of the contact vernaculars.

Examples:

Durative aspect: *ta sumí el sol; yo ta iscribí cuando ele ya vení; nisós ta comé; ele ta llorá*, etc.

Punctual aspect: *ya mirá ya vos con ele? yo ya comprá plátanos ayer; nisós ya andá na Manila; ya cabá de jacé su trabajo; ya cugí un piscao grande-grande.*

Contingent mode: *para cuando Pelisa de casá; ele di casá con María; nisós di andá na mercado; cómo de llorá yo? dónde tú de andá? como si de escupí el alma; el que vos de ordená que de suprí.*

(i) This fundamentally extremely simple, but perfectly adequate, scheme is made slightly more complex by three devices: reduplication, the adverbial (and postverbal) *ya*, and the use of the verb *cabá*. With this additional assistance the contact-vernacular verb becomes almost as subtle as the Spanish. Reduplication of the verb is discussed under VII below; its chief function is to intensify a progressive aspect, usually giving to the verb the sense of 'again and again'.

The adverb *ya* is used after the verb either to emphasize the punctual aspect: *yo ya mirá ya con ele*, or to form a contingent punctual: *ele de cabá ya su trabajo cuando vos de vení*, 'he will have finished his work by the time you arrive'. *Ele de cabá su trabajo* would mean simply 'he will finish his work'.

Cabá, 'finish', is used for the same purpose as the adverbial *ya*, but it has rather more force. As with Sp. *acabar de* it is followed by the preposition *de*.

(ii) In Zamboangueño there are sporadic examples of a periphrastic future formed with *andá*, which, whether used in this way or used alone, may or may not take an auxiliary particle: *yo ta andá comprá plátanos na mercado.*

The imperative is simply the word-base of the verb.

Examples: *jablá tú conmigo todo el veldade; no consentí vos.*

In Caviteño there is one exception to this rule in the sporadic *viniá* < *ven ya*, used alongside the regular *vení*.

15. The Spanish verb *ser* does not exist at all in these three dialects. It is not required to form the passive, which does not exist, and as a copula it is simply omitted.

The Spanish verb *estar* survives as the auxiliary particle *ta*, and in the reinforced forms discussed below, 15*b*. In the contact vernaculars it is always omitted after the interrogative *dónde*.

The omission of the copula is connected with the frequent use of the absolute construction in all three vernaculars.

Examples: *cuatro el mes que ya pasá; y ele tan guapa; no namás dos mil pesos el que ta gualdá na alcancía; polque un vida el que ya dejá con ele; cuánto éste? quién el que ya mandá llorá contigo? tú bata* (Zamboangueño: 'you are a child'); *qué hora ya ba?*

Dónde ba aquel libro blanco? dónde ba vos ayer? etc.

El mar, callao el boca; callao ilós dos; un duende, el ojos grandeng-grande, etc.

15*b*. In Ermitaño and Caviteño *está* has combined with *allí* and *allá* to form *tallí* and *tallá*. *Taquí* < *está aquí* also exists, but is less often employed.

Examples: *dónde ba tallá tú? dónde ba ya tallá vos ayer? el manzana tallí na mesa.*

Zamboangueño uses *está*, which it uses also in place of *quedar: está vos aquí* means 'wait here'.

Ermitaño has differentiated *tallí* and *tallá* as 'be here' and 'be there', ignoring the etymology of the words. There does not seem to be any clear distinction in the use of the various forms in Caviteño.

16. The interrogative and negative are formed with the aid of the Spanish negative *no* and the Tagalog interrogative *ba*.

In all three vernaculars the negative particle immediately precedes the verbal auxiliary.

Examples: *no ta vení; no ya podé; no de consentí*, etc.

The phrase *no pa*, 'not yet', also occupies the same position.

The interrogative particle is attached to the interrogative pronoun or adverb, if there is one, though in such circumstances it is not invariably required.

Examples: *dónde ba tallá tú?* or *dónde vos ya andá?*

Otherwise *ba* follows the verb.

Examples: *ya mirá ba vos con ele? ya llorá ba tú? no ya andá ba vos na mercado ayer? no de casá ba ele con Pedro? ya mirá ya ba vos el mujel?*

Summary Analysis

The form of the contact-vernacular verb is virtually that of the Spanish infinitive; in all three dialects the verbs, in contrast with nouns and adjectives, are almost exclusively derived from Spanish; and the auxiliary particles *ta*, *ya*, and *de* are Spanish (or Portuguese) in origin. But the psychology of the verb is essentially Malay and not Indo-European—Tagalog, not Spanish.

The verb has two modes, contingent and actual, the latter of which is further divided into two aspects, durative and punctual. With the assistance of the Spanish adverbial *ya* a contingent punctual may also be formed; while the use of the Spanish locution *acabar de* in the form *cabá de* is also used to express perfective notions.

It must also be noted that the contact-vernacular verb, though Tagalog in psychology, has nothing approaching the complexity and subtlety of the Tagalog verb. As we have seen in other instances, contact-vernacular practice is simpler than the practice of both the parent and the substratum language.

VI. The Preposition

17. There are only two simple prepositions to be considered in the contact vernaculars, *de* and *na*. *De* is Spanish *de*, while *na* is of uncertain origin, perhaps Portuguese.

De is used for all the usual attributive and genitive relationships, while *na* is a locative expressing 'in', 'on', 'to', 'over', etc.

17*b*. The most typical contact-vernacular preposition is the compound preposition which uses *na*.

Examples: *na junto de, na debajo de, na medio de, na detrás de, na puera de, na arriba de*, etc.

The middle term is quite clearly a substantive, as usages like *na su junto* demonstrate, and it is equally obvious that these compound prepositions are modelled on Tagalog.

Summary Analysis

In Tagalog, 'as far as "direction" or "location" is concerned, the preposition par excellence is *sa* together with the word denoting the direction or the location' (Cecilio López, *op. cit.*, p. 291). Other particles are also used, and there is a certain amount of freedom in the word-order, but the basic pattern of the Tagalog preposition is as in *sa ibabaw ng mesa*, 'on top of the table'. We may analyse the Tagalog preposition as: definite article (locative case) + substantive ('top', 'bottom', 'interior', etc.) + definite article (attributive case).

As we have already seen (**1*b*, 2**) it is possible to interpret *de* and *na* as the attributive and locative forms of an inflected contact-vernacular article, in which case the contact-vernacular preposition would be the same as in Tagalog: locative article + substantive + attributive article.

It is, therefore, perhaps wrong to regard *de* and *na* (17, above) as prepositions at all. The truth of the matter may well be that there are no prepositions in the contact vernaculars, but only prepositional phrases, or 'compound prepositions', made up of a noun and two inflected forms of the article, as in Tagalog.

VII. Reduplication

18. We have already discussed the function of reduplication in the adjective (III, 10), and we have seen that its effect is to intensify the force of the adverb-adjective. We spoke of it there as a kind of flexion of the adjective. Reduplication is not, in fact, a specifically adjectival

flexion, though it is only in the adjective that its function is essentially intensitive. See the analysis below.

18*b*. Reduplication may be found with nouns also.

Examples: *cosa-cosa medicinas, si cosa-cosa ele ta visá.*

Its function is here to make the noun indefinite, to make 'something' of 'thing'. In other instances it is a diminutive.

18*c*. With the verb reduplication becomes slightly more complex.

(i) We have first simple iteration, used in all three dialects.

Examples: *nisós ta comé-comé; ta jilví-jilví; di-si jelad jelad; ta subuk-subuk,* etc.

Occasionally there are instances of a logical analysis of this iteration as —*y*—, as in *jilví-y-jilví.*

This simple iteration may be Tagalog in origin.

(ii) Spanish too has a kind of reduplication of the verb after the pattern of *llora que llora.* This iteration with a connective *que* is very frequent in Caviteño and Zamboangueño and occurs in Ermitaño also.

Examples: *dale qui dale; suncal qui suncal.*

Both these types of reduplication indicate continuous or repetitive action. The progressive aspect of the verb may also be reinforced by the use of the Spanish reflexive *se* with the auxiliary particle.

Examples: *ta-si ingrandicí; di-si jelad-jelad; ya-si jelad-jelad.*

(iii) More complex reduplicated forms are found in Caviteño. All are used to give a continuous or repetitive force to the verb.

Example: *ta-si suncal qui ta-si suncal siempre.*

Summary Analysis

In Tagalog there are three types of reduplication (López, *op. cit.*, pp. 32–5) distinguished as 'iteration' (repetition of the entire word), 'repetition' (repetition of the last syllable of the word), and 'reduplication' (repetition of the first one or two sounds). Only the first of these is employed in the contact vernaculars.

Iteration is not a flexion in the contact vernaculars, and is not confined to any particular class of words, though semantic considerations limit its use to the adverb-adjective, the verb, and the noun. It escapes being a flexion also because it is not a purely formal device, but means, as we have had occasion to remark before, exactly what it says. Thus *buenung-bueno* and *dulcing-dulce* mean 'good-good' and 'sweet-sweet'; *ya mirá qui ya mirá* or *ya mira-mirá* means 'looked and looked'. The force of the reduplication is intimately connected with the sense of the part of speech reduplicated. With an adverb or adjective such reduplication can convey only intensification—to convey repetition would be semantically and logically impossible. With a verb, denoting an action, reduplication can convey only repeated, continuous, progressive, 'again-and-again' action.

With a noun it is conceivable that reduplication might indicate a plural, but in the only example we have in the texts it indicates indefiniteness—in some languages the plural is, in fact, formed by reduplication.

I may summarize my argument thus:

In any language reduplication of

a descriptive word indicates	intensification
a substantive	pluralization *or* indefiniteness *or* affectivity (diminutive)
a verb	repetition *or* continuity

Reduplication is found in Tagalog, and, in the first instance, may well have been borrowed from Tagalog; but reduplication is such a device as might occur to any speaker of any language attempting to convey any of the notions listed above. The connective used with adjectival reduplication indicates that the source is Tagalog; but the reduplication of the verb, though Tagalog reduplicates the word-bases of verb-like words to express continuous action: *kain ng kain,* 'eat-and-eat', *tawa ng tawa,* 'laugh and laugh', etc., is perhaps to be connected rather with the Spanish *llora que llora* device. In short, reduplication occurs in Tagalog and Spanish, and is liable to occur in any contact vernacular.

General Conclusions

We must first recapitulate briefly the conclusions to which we have already come. The noun, adjective, and verb in the contact vernaculars consist of an uninflected word-base whose syntactical relationships are expressed by means of particles. The definite article and the adjective (and therefore, if one chooses to look at it in that way, the noun) have a plural particle *mana* or *mañga* to convey number. The situation is slightly confused by the irregular survival of the Spanish plural flexion *-s.* The verb, with its three auxiliary particles, reproduces the psychology of the Tagalog verb. The 'preposition' or prepositional phrase of the contact vernaculars involves the substantivization of the true Spanish prepositions, and the use of the particles *na* and *de,* which, psychologically, correspond closely with the locative and attributive forms of the inflected Tagalog article. The pronoun and the possessive exhibit excessive confusion, partly the result of similar confusion with regard to the forms of the second person in Spanish America, but none of their forms are incompatible with the psychology of the Tagalog personal pronoun, and the common-gender *ele* is certainly to be attributed to Tagalog psychology. Reduplication in unmistakably Tagalog form is used in the intensification of the adjective, and also in the noun and verb.

In short, wherever Tagalog linguistic psychology is different from that of Spanish, the contact vernaculars follow Tagalog. The most convincing instances are to be found in the article, the preposition, and the verb.

On the other hand almost the entire vocabulary of the contact vernaculars is Spanish, and certain Spanish flexions (plural of nouns, forms of the pronoun and possessive) do survive. Furthermore contact-vernacular grammar is not Tagalog grammar but in every single instance represents a simplification of Tagalog practice. Contact-vernacular grammar is simplified Spanish grammar, interpreted in the light of Tagalog psychology.

The conclusions to which we are driven by this analysis are:

(i) that the old definition of a contact vernacular as a language whose vocabulary is drawn from one language and its grammar from another is so extreme a simplification of the real situation as to be almost inexact;

(ii) that Jespersen's attack (*op. cit.*) on the traditional view of contact vernaculars, in which he claims that the grammar of the substratum language is of no importance, is completely unfounded;

(iii) that a widely accepted theory with regard to the genesis of contact vernaculars: that they are uniquely the result of *European* simplification of the European language for consumption by natives, is only the half of the truth, if, indeed, it is part of the truth at all;

(iv) that the grammatical terminology of our Indo-European languages is as inadequate for discussing the grammar of contact vernaculars as it is inadequate for discussing the grammar of any language not a member of the Indo-European group.

Most monographs on different contact vernaculars entirely ignore or dismiss briefly the problem of their grammar, and concentrate on sound-changes, and the nature and extent of vocabulary-borrowing. Largely because of difficulty of access to the substratum language, grammatical features are ascribed to 'simplification' or 'confusion' when one feels that a description of the practice of the substratum language might be more relevant—but a great deal of nonsense has been written about Pidgin also, despite the fact that most writers on the subject should be familiar with the salient features of Chinese grammar.

The questions of sound-change and adaptation, and vocabulary-borrowing and semantic change, are far less important linguistically than the description of the impact of two distinct linguistic psychologies.

CHAPTER VII

THE SOUND-SYSTEMS OF THE CONTACT VERNACULARS

Introduction—The Sound-System of Spanish—The Sound-System of Tagalog—Comparison of the Sound-Systems of Spanish and Tagalog—The Sound-System of the Contact Vernaculars—Conclusions.

If the traditional view of contact-vernacular grammar and vocabulary has been that the one was drawn from the substratum language and the other from the parent tongue, the traditional view of the sound-system of a contact vernacular is that it consisted of the sounds common to parent and substratum language, the common factors of the two distinct sound-systems. The first corollary of such a proposition would be that the phonetic system of any contact vernacular would be simpler than that of either of the languages involved in its genesis. That this accepted view is an over-simplification of the case may be quickly understood by comparing Tagalog borrowings of Spanish words with the form of these words in the contact vernaculars: *sambalilo* [sambaˈlilo] against *sombrero* [somˈbrɛro], *disgrasiya*[disˈgrasija] against *desgracia* [dɛsˈgrasja], *kutsero* [kuˈtʃɛro] against *cochero* [kɔˈtʃɛro], *kampanà* [kamˈpɑnaʔ] against *campana* [kamˈpɑna], and so on. The contact vernaculars retain from Spanish sounds which are not used in Tagalog. In addition Tagalog regularly dislocates the accent in Spanish words containing a medial consonantal group, where the contact vernaculars preserve the Spanish accentuation: Tagalog *karné* [karˈne] against *carne* [ˈkarne], *bulsá* [bulˈsɑ] against *bolsa* [ˈbɔlsa], etc.

However, to understand the phonetics of Ermitaño and the other dialects we must first examine the sound-systems of Spanish and Tagalog. An accurate examination of the reaction of these two systems cannot be attempted, for the history of the contact vernaculars is undocumented, and the contact has extended over a period of four centuries during which the sound-system of Spanish has undergone certain changes, and Tagalog doubtless underwent others of which we know little or nothing. I shall not, therefore, set out in the fullest detail the sound-system of either Spanish or Tagalog, which may be found in other works.

The Sound-system of Spanish

Vowel-system

The vowels of Spanish are [a], [e], [i], [o], and [u], with slight variations which are of no importance for our examination of the Philippine contact vernaculars, because of the neutralizing effect of the basically trivocalic system of the Malayan languages.

The diphthongs are combinations of [i] or [u], [j] or [w], with the stronger vowels, generally as increasing or ascending diphthongs: [je], [we], although decreasing or descending diphthongs also exist [eĭ], [aŭ].

There are also a limited number of triphthongs.

Consonant-system

1. Occlusives.

Spanish has the normal voiced and voiceless series: [b] (*baño, vida, enviar*), [d] (*de*), [g] (*gato*), [p] (*padre, absurdo*), [t] (*tío*), and [k] (*acuerdo, acaba*).

2. Fricatives.

a. The fricative forms of the voiced occlusives: [β], [ð], and [ɣ], as in *caballo, comprado, hago.*

b. The voiceless labiodental [f], and in the sixteenth century its voiced equivalent [v].

c. The voiceless interdental [θ], as in *cielo, Cádiz*, and the variant [ð] which occurs before a voiced consonant. The [θ] does not occur in American or Andalusian Spanish.

3. Sibilants.

Standard Castilian uses the cacuminal sibilants [ś] and [ź] (both written as *S*). The voiced variety occurs only through the influence of a following voiced consonant, as in *rasgar* [rraź'ɣaɹ].

However, both the coronal [ṡ, ż] and the dorso-alveolar varieties of the sibilant are also used, the coronal in Andalusia, and the dorso-alveolar (English *s*) in parts of Andalusia and Spanish America.

4. Affricates.

[tʃ]. The occlusive element is not as explosive as in English. The voiced form [dʒ] exists, though not as a pronunciation of orthographic *CH*. It is the sound of initial *Y* in *yo, ya*, or of *Y* after *L* or *N*: *cónyuge* ['kɔndʒuxe].

5. Laterals.

a. [l], which may be dental, interdental, or alveolar, according to the position of the following consonant.

b. The palatal [ʎ], orthographically *LL*, as in *caballo, llamar*, etc. A phenomenon general in South America and the south of Spain is *yeísmo*, the pronunciation of [ʎ] as [j]. The pronunciation [ʎ] is conserved only along the Andean cordillera, extending eastwards through Bolivia to Paraguay.

6. Vibrants.

a. The single trilled [r], as in *pero* ['pɛro].

b. The multiple trill [rr] as in *rosa* ['rrɔsa], *perro* ['pɛrro].

c. The relaxed fricative [ɹ], as in *hablar* [aβ'laɹ].

7. Nasals.

a. Bilabial [m].

b. Labiodental [ɱ], as in *anfiteatro.*

c. [n], which may be dental or alveolar according to the point of articulation of the following consonant.

d. Palatal [ɲ], as in *señor.*

e. Velar [ŋ], as in *banco, un carro* [uŋ 'karro].

8. Aspirates.

a. In Peninsular Spanish the voiceless uvular vibrant [x] as in *jota, general.*

b. In Andalusia and much of Spanish America, the voiceless laryngeal [h] (as in English) is used in place of the Spanish *jota* [x], and is also employed where sixteenth-century Spanish had an aspirate [h], in words like *hacer.*

9. Semi-consonants.

a. Palatal [j], *reyes, cayó.*

b. Velar [w], *cuadro.*

The Sound-system of Tagalog

Vowel-system

Tagalog has, essentially, a trivocalic system, with the three basic vowels [a], [i], and [u]. But, as in the Malayan group generally, vowel tones in Tagalog are uncertain, and in the final syllable of a word spoken alone, or a phrase, an [i] or [u] is almost always lowered to [e] or [o]. [e] and [o] also occur in a limited number of words when the consonant between two vowels is the glottal stop: *oo* ['ɔʔɔ], *doón* [dɔ'ʔɔn], *leég* [lɛ'ʔɛg]; and in addition in a rather larger number of borrowings from Spanish.

Consonant-system

1. Occlusives.

Tagalog has the normal voiced and voiceless series: [b], [d], [g], [p], [t], [k]. As finals they are implosive.

2. Fricatives.

There is a sporadic occurrence of a bilabial fricative [β] in intervocalic positions, as in *tubig* ['tuβig].

3. Sibilants.

a. The voiceless postdental [s].

b. Palatal [ʃ] (orthographically *S* before *IY* or *Y*, as in *siyá*). This sound may be only slightly palatalized.

4. Affricates.

[tʃ], orthographically *TS*, as in *intsék* (although this word is usually pronounced [in'sɛk]) or *kutsero* [ku'tʃɛro].

5. Laterals.

[l] is always postdental.

6. Vibrants.

Tagalog has only the single trilled [r]. It occurs in an intervocalic position in an extremely limited number of simple words, like *araw*,

'day', 'sun'. Elsewhere it is merely a variant of [d]. It occurs freely however in borrowings from Spanish: *tirén<tren*, *tarabaho<trabajo*, etc.

7. Nasals.

[m], [n], and [ŋ]. All three are subject to interchange, by assimilation to a following consonant. So *sang+pu>sampu*, *sadn+ka>sadng ka pang+dikit>pandikit*, *pang+saydw>pansaydw*, etc.

8. Aspirates.

a. The voiceless laryngeal [h], which occurs only as an initial, or as a glide between a word ending in a vowel and a suffix beginning with a vowel: *asa+an>asahan*.

b. In addition we may mention under this heading the voiceless vibrant [x], which occurs as a variant of [k]: [mala'xas] for [mala'kas] (*malakás*).

9. Semi-consonants.

a. Palatal [j]: *gaya*.

b. Velar [w]: *tawag*.

10. The glottal stop.

The glottal stop [ʔ] is orthographically represented in Tagalog by a grave accent over the vowel it follows: *awà* ['awaʔ]. It has no written sign when it occurs between vowels: *baang* ['baʔaŋ], *oo* ['ɔʔɔ].

COMPARISON OF THE SOUND-SYSTEMS OF SPANISH AND TAGALOG

For our purposes, the most important consideration in comparing the sound-systems of Spanish and Tagalog is to ascertain what Spanish sounds would be likely to prove difficult for speakers whose native language was Tagalog or a related tongue. Ignoring for the moment the sporadic variants in both Spanish and Tagalog, we may list the consonants as follows:

Fricatives: [ð], [ɣ], [f], [v], [θ]
Sibilants: [ś], [ź]
Affricates: [tʃ], [dʒ]
Laterals: [ʎ]
Vibrants: [rr], [ɹ]
Nasals: [ɲ]
Aspirates: [x]

It is clear that it is in the treatment of these sounds that we shall find the characteristics which will most distinguish the sound-systems of the contact vernaculars from that of standard (or South American) Spanish.

THE SOUND-SYSTEM OF THE CONTACT VERNACULARS

Fricatives

1. [ð]. The fricative [ð] is used scarcely at all in any of the contact vernaculars, and where it does, sporadically, occur, it is almost certainly due to recent Spanish contamination. It is normally replaced by the fully

occlusive [d], and the pronunciation of such a word as *vida*, Spanish ['biða], is ['bida] in all the three dialects, as it is in all Tagalog borrowings of Spanish words.

There is, however, the case of the past participle of the Spanish *-ar* verbs, which in modern Peninsular Spanish is not only [a^{ð}o], but even more often [a^{ð}o] or even [aŭ]. Ermitaño and Caviteño here do not attempt to use an occlusive [d], but approximate more nearly to the Spanish pronunciation by simply omitting it, and pronouncing [aŭ].

So, while the [ð] is fully plosive in words like *pondo*, *donde*, *podé*, *mirada*, etc., it has entirely disappeared from words like *dorao*, *callao*, *colorao*, *masiao*, *dimasiao*, *desgraciao*, *pescao*, *empapao*, *gualdao*, *desesperao*, *tirao*, *mojao*, *espantao*, *ispantanao*, *iluminao*, etc., etc.

Zamboangueño is much less consistent about omitting the [ð] in such circumstances, and in the modern dialect usage varies almost equally between [ado] [aðo], and [aŭ]. We may be fairly certain that the primitive form of the vernacular used the Ermitaño and Caviteño forms.

When the [ð] is final, as in *red*, *verdad*, *ciudad*, etc., it is always fully occlusive in the northern dialects, to the extent that it has sometimes been reinforced by a final vowel, as in *rede* ['rεde], and *veldade* [bel'dade]. I have no record of this occurring in Zamboangueño.

2. [ɣ]. The intervocalic [ɣ] is never fricative in the northern dialects, and is so only sporadically in Zamboangueño. Spanish [xu'ɣaɹ] (*jugar*) becomes [hu'gaʔ].

3. [f]. The labio-dental fricative has now found its way into Tagalog, where it did not exist originally, in a large number of borrowed words, though there usually exists a fully Tagalized form alongside the more foreign word, and in speech it is felt to be somewhat affected to pronounce [f]. So, in Tagalog, we find *Filipinas* alongside *Pilipinas*, *fiyesta* alongside *piyesta*.

In Ermitaño and Caviteño [f] is regularly replaced by [p]. We find *pondo*, *puelte*, *plores*, *diperente*, *peliz*, etc., for *fondo*, *fuerte*, *flores*, *diferente*, *feliz*, etc.

In Zamboangueño, apart from the regular [p] of the northern vernaculars, and a correct [f], due to recent Spanish contamination, we have the voiceless bilabial fricative [ɸ], which, curiously enough, seems to occur as a hybrid of [p] and [f], since the substratum languages do not have this sound.

4. [v]. The voiced labio-dental disappeared in Spain in the course of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and became identical with the pronunciation of orthographic *B*, that is, an occlusive [b] when initial, and a bilabial fricative [β] when intervocalic. In the northern dialects *vida* and *vos* are pronounced ['bida] and [bos], as in Spanish. The intervocalic *V* is usually a fully plosive [b], though there are sporadic instances of the use of a bilabial fricative [β], which is not surprising, since the sound also exists for intervocalic *B* in Tagalog.

In Zamboangueño, however, we find a distinction between *B* and *V* observed with considerable regularity. It is true that the normal contact-

vernacular solution of substituting a bilabial occlusive or fricative also occurs, but there are numerous instances of the use of the voiced labio-dental, *vos*, *vení*, and *vida* being pronounced as [vos], [vɛˈniʔ], and [ˈvida]. It is certainly true that some of the southern Philippine languages possess the voiced labio-dental, but there are virtually insoluble problems of transmission. The labio-dental was lost in Castilian during the sixteenth century, and disappeared from the southern Castilian dialects, Extremeño and Andaluz, in the course of the seventeenth century. It survives only in the Spanish of the Jews of Salonika, Istanbul, and the eastern Mediterranean (and then not as a regular phonetic feature), who were driven out of Spain in 1496. It is impossible that Ermitaño and Caviteño could have preserved the distinction from the earliest contact, transmitted it to Zamboangueño in the eighteenth century, and then have adopted their present solution. All the Chavacano-speakers with whom I talked in Zamboanga spoke a little English and could write their names, and though the contact-vernaculars are not normally written down, I suspect that the daily column written in Chavacano in the pre-war newspaper, with its orthography based on standard Spanish, is the source of this puzzling sound. The average speaker of Chavacano knows English and a Visayan language as well as his Chavacano, while comparatively few know Spanish. The knowledge that *V* was pronounced [v] in English and certain of the southern languages must have brought about the same pronunciation for the Chavacano words *vos* and *vida*, spelt, of course, with a *V* by the newspaper. The incorrect pronunciations brought about by the influence of orthography are a common-place in English, and, though the situation may be a little different, I see no other solution to the problem. Incidentally *Chavacano* is always spelt and pronounced *Chabacano*.

It is perhaps worthy of note that intervocalic *V* sometimes appears in Tagalog as [w] (*llave*>*yawe*), though this does not seem to have any bearing on our present problem.

5. [θ]. The *seseo*, the pronunciation of C^{e-i} and *Z* as [s] is regular in all three dialects. The *seseo* became general in southern Spain round about 1600, and is now standard in the whole of South America. Before 1600, that is after the first contact of Spanish with a Malay language in Ternate, C^{e-i} was pronounced as [t͡s] and *Z* as [d͡z]. The northern [θ] and the southern [s] are equally valid solutions of the affricate, and it is just possible that the *seseo* of the contact vernaculars also represents a solution of an affricate. More probably the contact-vernacular *seseo* is simply derived from American Spanish: it is not necessarily even the Malay solution of Castilian [θ].

Sibilants

6. [ś]. The Spanish cacuminal [ś] is not reproduced in any of the contact vernaculars, nor even in the ultra-correct modern Spanish of Manila. There is, however, insufficient evidence to decide whether the habits of Tagalog-speakers or Mexicans are the more important factor in the production of a dorso-alveolar [s] in the contact vernaculars.

Affricates

7. [tʃ]. Tagalog had originally no affricate, but [tʃ], orthographically *TS*, is now found in a large number of borrowed words: *kutsilyo*, *kutsara*, *kutsero*, etc., from Spanish *cuchillo*, *cuchara*, *cochero*. After a consonant the affricate may be reduced to [s], but otherwise Tagalog fails to reproduce the sound only when it is initial: *sinelas*<*chinela*. The contact vernaculars reproduce the sound correctly in all positions.

8. [dʒ]. *Ya*, [dʒa] in Spanish, and employed in the three dialects both as an adverb and an auxiliary verb, is always [ja]. *Yo*, Spanish [dʒɔ], is similarly [jo].

Laterals

9. The dark *l* [ɫ] occurs sporadically in all three dialects, most noticeably, perhaps, in Zamboangueño. It is almost certainly a recent development brought about by speakers of English, since the sound occurs neither in Tagalog nor in Spanish.

10. [ʎ]. In Tagalog borrowings from Spanish the palatal is treated in two different ways. The older entrants into the language resolved the difficulty by using either an [l] or a [j]. Thus we have *kabayo*<Sp. *caballo*, but *kastilà*<Sp. *Castilla*. Alongside *kabayo* we have, however, *kabalyerisa*, 'stable', and *kabalyete*, 'carpenter's horse'. As a general rule [lj] (orthographically *LY*) is the usual Tagalog solution for the intervocalic palatal, with occasional [j] (*Y*) or [l] (*L*), while initially the palatal is always reduced to [j] (*Y*), as *yawe*<*llave*.

In all the contact vernaculars the palatal is preserved without any trace of South American *yeísmo*, or the Tagalog solution of [j], though there are indubitably many instances of the pronunciation [lj], sometimes very difficult to detect.

Vibrants

11. [r], [rr], and [ɹ].

The multiple trill [rr] does not exist in the contact vernaculars, and even the highly contaminated Zamboangueño rarely corrects its pronunciation in this respect. In all three dialects, *rosa*, *enterrá*, *corré*, *recio*, *rayo*, etc., where Spanish has [rr] become [ˈrosa], [ɛnteˈra], [kɔˈrɛʔ], [ˈrɛsjo], [ˈrajo].

Spanish post-consonantal and intervocalic [r] remains as [r] in all three dialects. *Puera*, *suspirá*, *agora*, etc., are pronounced as [ˈpwɛra], [suspiˈraʔ], [aˈgɔra].

Spanish pre-consonantal *R*, which varies from [r] to [ɹ] in standard Castilian pronunciation, is resolved in the contact vernaculars in one of two ways: either it remains as a flapped [r] (*recordá* [rɛkɔrˈda], *carne* [ˈkarne], *nervios* [ˈnɛrbjos], etc.), or it may become [l] (*Vilgen*, *puelte*, *dolmido*, *celca*, *muelto*, *gualdá*, *puelco*, *cuelpo*, *conveltí*, *jilví*, *veldade*, etc., etc.). Even Ermitaño shows an overwhelming preponderance of [l] and in Caviteño it is the only solution. Zamboangueño has both, preferring the Spanish form with [r], but this is probably recent contamination.

A further solution to the difficulty of the preconsonantal [r] is metathesis, as in *presigná*<*persignar*.

Final [ɹ], fricative in Spanish, is treated in a great variety of ways. Although the orthography of the texts indicates only three, there are, in fact, five.

a. The fricative may be retained. This is unusual, even in Zamboangueño, and is almost certainly again due to recent Spanish contamination.

b. It may become a flapped [r]. This generates a following neutral vowel of support: *hablar*>[jabˈlarᵊ]. This solution is about as common as the retention of the fricative, and probably represents merely a failure to imitate Spanish correctly.

c. It may be treated in the same way as pre-consonantal [r] and become [l], as *mujel* [muˈhɛl] for *mujer* [muˈxɛɹ], *pol* for *por*, *ñol* for *señor*, etc. This solution is again sporadic, though probably more characteristic of contact vernaculars than either of the two mentioned above.

Even though transcriptions of Ermitaño, Caviteño, and Zamboangueño show a final *R* in a great many words: *amor*, *dolor*, *señor*, *doctor*, *resplandor*, *por*, *mar*, etc., an [r] or [ɹ] is only very rarely pronounced: the two most frequent solutions in all three dialects are either:

d. The complete elimination of the sound; or *e.:* The substitution of the glottal stop [ʔ]. This latter solution is undoubtedly by far the most common of all these five possibilities, and is the solution we should expect to find.

While many Andalusians eliminate completely the final [ɹ] and say *caló* for *calor*, *señó* for *señor*, etc., and while some such pronunciation may have assisted the loss of final [ɹ] in the contact vernaculars, it would seem that the solution of a glottal stop is due to a strengthening rather than to a relaxing of the fricative, to the use of a flapped [r], itself a species of stop, than to the employment of a relaxed fricative. The reinforcement of the final [ɹ] to a flapped [r] and then to a multiple trill [rr] is found in the area from Salamanca to Zamora in northern Spain, but the south, and South America, uniformly prefer a relaxation of the tension. Be that as it may, it would seem that the glottal stop is employed in the contact vernaculars as a substitute for some other kind of stop. In modern Spanish the flap occurs only in an area which we cannot suppose to have influenced the contact vernaculars of the Philippines, but on the other hand we have no reliable information about the pronunciation of final *R* in Spain or South America during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, which may well have been that of flapped [r], or alternatively a combination of flap and glottal stop, a pronunciation which is not mentioned by Navarro Tomás, but which certainly occurs sporadically in modern Spanish, particularly in oratorical or stage delivery. The simultaneous pronunciation of glottal stop and flapped [r] would certainly account for the Tagalog [ʔ] in the contact vernaculars.

The contact-vernacular verb, derived from the Spanish infinitive (which, of course, ends in *R*) is written without a final consonant in the transcriptions I have copied. In a majority of cases it is pronounced with a final glottal stop.

For the use of the glottal stop in other circumstances, where it does not exist in Spanish, see below 15.

Nasals

12. [ɲ]. Tagalog does not have the palatal [ɲ], and in borrowings from Spanish [nj], orthographically *NY*, is substituted: *pinyá*<*piña*, *panyô*< *paño*, etc. Indubitably the pronunciation [nj] does occur in the contact vernaculars, but it is rather difficult to tell in every case whether it is a true palatal [ɲ] or the double sound of [nj] which is being used.

13. [ŋ]. The velar [ŋ] does not occur as a separate phoneme in Spanish, but is simply the sound of *N* before $C^{a\text{-}o\text{-}u}$, as in *banco* [ˈbaŋko]. The contact vernaculars have also, however, borrowed words from Tagalog, where the [ŋ] is phonemic, and although the Spanish [ŋ] is never reduced to [n], the Tagalog plural particle *mangá* [maˈŋa] becomes *mana* [ˈmana] in both Ermitaño and Zamboangueño. *Ngâ* [ŋaʔ], however, is still [ŋaʔ] in all three dialects, while Caviteño preserves [ˈmaŋa] also, with dislocation of the accent.

Aspirates

14. [x]. The uvular vibrant [x] is never used in any of the contact vernaculars, and is even lacking in the modern Spanish of Manila, where it is relaxed almost to an [h]. All the contact vernaculars use the laryngeal [h], present in Tagalog, and employ the same sound for the aspirate [h] which went out of use in Spain during the seventeenth century, but is still retained in Andalusia and South America, where the [h] is also employed instead of the [x]. Here again we are faced with the problem of determining whether contact-vernacular practice owes more to the Tagalog habit of substituting [h] for [x], or to an American use of [h] in place of Castilian [x]. Equally, there is the problem of whether Tagalog substituted in its borrowed words an approximately equivalent sound, or whether it simply used an [h] where it heard one, in the mouths of American or Andalusian speakers.

Glottal stop

15. The glottal stop is heard in many instances in all three dialects where it does not exist in Spanish. So we find, as well as the forms without the stop, such forms as [ˈbwɛnoʔ] and [siʔ]. This is exactly similar to the Tagalog practice of adding a gratuitous glottal stop to many words borrowed from Spanish which have no final stop of any kind: *bintanà* [binˈtanaʔ]<Sp. *ventana* [bɛnˈtana], *bandilà*<*bandera*, etc. (The grave accent denotes a following glottal stop.)

The vowels

The sound-systems of the three dialects vary considerably in their treatment of the Spanish vowels. Closest to Spanish usage is Ermitaño, and closest to Tagalog is Caviteño, with Zamboangueño occupying a central position, and now tending to one, and now to the other, extreme.

In all three, however, we are essentially concerned with one feature: the raising of Spanish [e] and [o] to [i] and [u]. Ermitaño offers only sporadic examples of this phenomenon, and some of them may be non-phonetic, such as *viní* and *sintí* in place of the more usual *vení* and *sentí*. It is possible that this [i] is derived, not from the Spanish infinitive, but by analogy with such forms as the gerundive, the preterite, and the subjunctives derived therefrom. With a word like *celestial*, however, which appears as *cilestial*, there is no possibility of analogical influence, and we have a genuine case of a raising of the vowel.

In Caviteño, Spanish [e] and [o] are very often raised to [i] and [u]: *cumida*, *cumprá*, *vicino*, *nuay*, *cucí*, *llivá*, *puní*, *quidá*, etc., etc., but, except in the case of the verb word-base derived from the Spanish infinitive (*pudí<poder*) almost never when the [e] or [o] is tonic. Furthermore, though there are sporadic instances of the contrary, the final post-tonic vowel is not raised. (In Tagalog the final vowel is usually lowered). The one noteworthy exception to this rule is the intensive form of the adjective, where the connective [ŋ] often follows a raised vowel: [ˈbwɛnuŋ-ˈbwɛno], [ˈdulsiŋ-ˈdulse], etc.

Zamboangueño offers so many contradictions that it is scarcely worthwhile to attempt to formulate any rules.

In general we may say that in Caviteno pretonic [e] and [o] are raised to [i] and [u], as well as the final tonic syllable of verbs derived from Spanish infinitives in *-er*, and the post-tonic vowel before final [ŋ]. Ermitaño, in general, follows Spanish.

Ermitaño, together with Caviteño, shows one very peculiar case: *nisós* <*nosotros*, where the vowel is not only raised but brought from the back to the forward series. One can only suggest dissimilation as a rather unsatisfactory explanation.

Diphthongs

In Tagalog borrowings from Spanish all diphthongs are regularly analysed into two vowels connected by the appropriate glide. Thus *piano* becomes *piyano*, *cuadro>kuwadro*, *cuento>kuwento*, *cuero>kuwero*, *viaje>biyahe*, *anuncio>anunsiyo*, *diario>diyariyo*, etc., etc. Though no transcriptions of any of the dialects that I have seen attempt to reproduce this Tagalog orthography, it is indubitable that this pronunciation does occur, certainly in Caviteño and Zamboangueño, alongside a correctly formed diphthong as in Spanish. It is in the same case with the Tagalog analysis of the palatals [ɲ] and [ʎ] into [nj] and [lj]. The borderline between [ˈkwɛro] and [kuˈwɛro] is by no means clear, and in speech it is often difficult to detect the difference in specific cases, but the impression one receives of the greater care taken in pronouncing diphthongs is probably due to the fugitive vowel [ˈkᵘwɛro], which in turn is due to the existence of this pronunciation in Tagalog.

Conclusions

Comparison of the Consonants of Spanish, Tagalog, and the Contact Vernaculars

A large number of consonants are virtually identical in Spanish and Tagalog, and are reproduced as in both these languages by the contact vernaculars. They are, therefore, useless for our purpose, which is to determine the essential relationships of the contact-vernacular sound-systems with those of Spanish on the one hand and Tagalog on the other. The sounds involved are: [b], [d], [g], [p], [t], [k], [l], [m], and [n]. In one detail the contact vernaculars stand apart from both Spanish and Tagalog: where the Spanish word has a final fricative [ð], the vernaculars substitute a fully plosive [d], and never employ the final implosive occlusive which is a regular feature of Tagalog.

In three cases we cannot be certain whether the contact vernaculars are following Tagalog speech-habits or merely imitating South American Spanish. The sounds concerned are Castilian [θ], [ś], and [x], which in American Spanish, Tagalog, and all the contact vernaculars, become [s], [s], and [h]. However, the fact that the contact vernaculars also use an [h] in such words as *hacer* indicates the latter possibility.

We have now a total of twelve consonants which we are forced to designate as inconclusive, though three of them tend to indicate that Mexican Spanish was the basis of the vernaculars.

The reduction of Spanish multiple-trill [rr] to a flapped [r] in Tagalog and the contact vernaculars would seem to point to Tagalog influence; but the mutation of preconsonantal flapped [r] or fricative [ɹ] to [l] is a feature of vulgar Spanish, as much as a Tagalog solution. The use of the glottal stop to render a Spanish final *R* may constitute a Tagalizing tendency, but is not entirely conclusive.

We have then four fricatives, [β], [ð], [ɣ], and [f]. In each of these cases the contact vernaculars follow Tagalog in using the equivalent occlusive forms, [b], [d], and [g], with [p] doing duty for [f].

In three other cases, however, the contact vernaculars agree with Spanish against Tagalog: in the correct employment of initial [tʃ], which Tagalog imitates only when it is intervocalic, and in the use of the true palatals [ʎ] and [ɲ] in place of the Tagalog approximations [lj] and [nj]. It is, of course, possible that [ʎ] and [ɲ] are later corrections, made by individual speakers who had had some contact with correct Spanish, particularly since we should expect to find *yeísmo* accompanying the *seseo* of the vernaculars.

On the other hand, we find the simplification of Tagalog *mangá* to *mana* in Ermitaño, and dislocation of the accent in Caviteño, which reproduces the velar [ŋ] correctly. Indeed we find dislocation of he accent in most of the words which the contact vernaculars have borrowed from Tagalog.

In short, the consonant-system of the vernaculars is by no means merely the list of sounds common to Spanish and Tagalog, even though some of the most striking of the modifications of standard Spanish ([p] <[f]) did occur in that sense. The contact-vernacular sounds not used in Spanish include intervocalic [ŋ] and the glottal stop [ʔ]; while those not used in Tagalog include initial [tʃ], [ʎ], and [ɲ]. Sounds used in neither Spanish nor Tagalog, but found in Zamboangueño, are [v] and dark [ɫ], derived most probably from English speech-habits.

Vowels

With the vowels it is again obvious that the notion of a contact vernacular's employing only sounds common to parent and substratum language is only half the truth. All three dialects have tonic [e] and [o] (as modern Tagalog has, too, in many borrowed words) which show no tendency to approximate to Tagalog usage. On the other hand a raising of the vowels does occur, especially in Caviteño, and also, sporadically, a Tagalog-like analysis of the Spanish diphthongs into their component vowels, linked by a palatal or velar glide.

CHAPTER VIII

THE VOCABULARY OF THE CONTACT VERNACULARS

Minimum Requirements—Common Spanish Words Absent from the Contact Vernaculars—Semantic Change—Loan-Words—Conclusions.

MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

WHEN, formerly, it was considered necessary to justify the study of contact vernaculars, one of the most frequent among the various species of pretext adduced at various times was that in point of grammar and vocabulary the contact vernaculars represented the irreducible minimum for any language. The notion is fallacious, for reasons too obvious to enumerate; but it does contain a grain of truth, and, while it is not nowadays necessary to offer any excuse for examining any variety of human speech, the 'minimum requirements' of contact vernaculars do constitute one of their most interesting aspects.

A number of studies of contact vernaculars include, therefore, a vocabulary of the language in question. So Churchill's *Beach-la-Mar* contains what purports to be a complete vocabulary of the language. This is a list of four hundred words, a figure which includes a count of all the particles, separates 'come' and 'coming', 'missi' and 'missis', 'whiteman' and 'whitefellow', 'look', 'look out', and 'look round', etc., and even then includes a number of words which Churchill considers suspicious, that is possibly the invention or erroneous recollection of the transcriber, and certainly of limited diffusion. Beach-la-Mar is found, in fact, to have an effective vocabulary of not much more than two hundred and fifty words. We are all familiar with the extravagant circumlocutions with which Beach-la-Mar attempted to overcome this handicap: *little fellow bokus you shove him he cry, you pull him he cry* for 'concertina', or *coconut belong him grass no stop* for 'bald', or *apple belong stink* for 'onion', and so on.[1]

But the vocabulary of Beach-la-Mar is not an absolute minimum vocabulary. It is simply the smallest number of words required for communication at a certain level of culture—and at a certain level of communication. There are no theoretical conclusions to be drawn, or at least not of any general nature on minimum requirements. As with

[1] Since this book went to press I have been able to see the 4th revised edition of John J. Murphy, *The Book of Pidgin English*, Brisbane (Australia), 1954. This work contains a Pidgin dictionary—this Pidgin is, of course, Beach-la-Mar, and not Chinese-English Pidgin—of over 1,500 words, including words for 'bald' and 'onion': *keila* and *anian*. (Murphy writes, p. 1, that 'it has a synoptic vocabulary of over 1,300 words', p. 23 that 'it has a vocabulary of some 1,400 words'). The language of which this is a practical text-book is known to its speakers as '*Tok Pisin*' ('Pidgin talk'), and is now *creolized* in much of the Territory of New Guinea, having currency over a much wider area, New Britain, New Ireland, the Solomons, and Papua, as a *lingua franca*. In short, the information on which I based the preceding paragraph is twenty years out of date. This does not invalidate my main point, which Murphy makes also: 'Of course there are things outside the experience of Pidgin-English and for which there are no words'.

grammar one can perfectly well work out what is totally superfluous, what assists in dispelling possible ambiguity, and what is absolutely essential without reference to any contact vernacular. In any case it does not seem that evidence from contact vernaculars does really assist the theorist, as witness Jespersen, who could perpetrate *Novial* six years after the study of contact vernaculars included in his work on language.

In any case the Philippine vernaculars are not in the same case with Beach-la-Mar or Pidgin or Chinook. One would have to undertake to compile not a vocabulary but an entire dictionary, for the Philippine dialects are creolized languages, and furthermore languages which achieved creolization in a short space of time, and which were thereafter in discontinuous but still frequent contact with Spanish. The vocabulary of the Philippine vernaculars certainly amounts to more than five thousand words, and may approach ten thousand. Under these circumstances, therefore, our concern cannot be with 'minimum requirements', but merely with the kinds of difference which exist between the vocabulary of the contact vernaculars and that of Spanish. These differences fall naturally under three heads.

1. Common Spanish Words Absent from the Contact Vernaculars

I am not here concerned with the absence of particles of any kind—the reasons for the elimination of many Spanish prepositions, conjunctions, and pronouns have already been dealt with under Grammar—but only with 'full' words: nouns, verbs and adjective-adverbs.

Perhaps the most interesting group of common Spanish words which we fail to find in the contact vernaculars is a handful of highly irregular verbs: *ser*, *decir*, *ver*, *ir* and *oír*. It is true that *decir* is sometimes found in the form *dice*, with the sense of 'they say' or 'it is said', and that *oír* occurs in the set phrase *ul misa*, but neither of these verbs is normally conjugated with the three auxiliary particles. *Ser* is entirely omitted—simple appositional arrangement dispenses with the copula; *decir* is replaced by *hablar; oír* is replaced by *entender* and *escuchar; ver* is replaced by *mirar; ir* is replaced by *andar;* and finally *traer* is often replaced by *llevar*.

These verbs are irregular in Spanish, but since the contact vernaculars use only forms derived from the infinitive we must look further for an explanation. And while it is true that the hypothetical contact-vernacular forms **sé*, **vé*, and **í* appear rather underweighted, the same is not true of **decí*. It is clear that we are concerned with a preference for regular verbs, a situation which could not have come about unless there had been an initial period during which the natives—even though they probably already spoke Portuguese Pidgin—did attempt to use Spanish flexional forms, and in the course of their experiments discovered that they were less likely to be misunderstood when they employed the regular verbs. A failure to distinguish between the different uses of *ver* and *mirar*, *ir* and *andar*, *decir* and *hablar*—still, sometimes, confusing to the beginner—would contribute to the final result.

It is interesting to note that such irregular but irreplaceable verbs as *poder* and *tener* occur sporadically in their inflected forms, *puede* and *tiene*, while *querer* is also present alongside the inflected form *quiere* despite the fact that it was presumably replaceable by some such verb as *desear*.

Another type of simplification eliminates the Spanish word *árbol*, 'tree'. It is regularly replaced by the Tagalog word *punò* in its Hispanicized form *pono*. In Spanish an apple is *manzana*, while an apple-tree is *manzano;* but though a pear is *pera*, a pear-tree is not **pero* but *peral;* a fig is *higo*, but a fig-tree is *higuera;* while a walnut is *nuez* but a walnut-tree *nogal*. Although these are not exactly the fruit and trees which the contact vernaculars are concerned with, it must have been some such confusion in Spanish terminology which led to the semi-translation of the Tagalog method of distinguishing fruit and trees: a very simple, logical, and analogical device. In all our texts *pono* appears to designate the tree: *un pono de plátanos*, *un pono de camanchilis*, *un pono de naranjita*, *un pono de cajel*, etc.

Family relationships are conveyed by both Spanish and Tagalog words, but Spanish *madre* and *padre* are missing (*padre* is reserved for the priest, by exception a specialization rather than an extension of the meaning here) and are supplanted by Tagalog *nay* and *tay*, *nana* and *tata*.

Pairs of synonyms are reduced to one member. Ermitaño and Caviteño have *guapa* to the exclusion of *bonita*, while Zamboangueño uses only *bonita*. Indeed I was informed in Zamboanga that *guapa* was not a Chavacano but a Visayan word. The reduction of pairs of synonyms may also partly account for the absence of *ver*, *decir*, *ir*, etc. See above.

There are a few other common words which do not appear to be used in the contact vernaculars; but none of these absences is particularly significant. The main causes operative in vocabulary-change are summarized below.

2. Semantic Change

The principal differences between the vocabulary of the contact vernaculars and that of Spanish lie in the semantic changes which have taken place in the contact vernaculars. In almost every instance this change has been in the direction of an extension of the meaning, and the most important single cause of semantic shift has been morphological and syntactical simplification.

One large class of words whose semantic areas have been expanded is formed by the verbs and the adjective-adverbs. Since contact-vernacular grammar admits of no reflexives, and makes no distinction between transitive and intransitive, *levantá*, for instance, means both *levantarse*, 'get up', 'rise', and *levantar*, 'lift', 'raise'. Most verbs have this double sense, and some add a third by acquiring a causative sense also.

Similarly the identification of the forms of the adjective and adverb has led to certain semantic extensions. Thus, when *chiquitito* is used with adverbial force, semantic extension follows as a matter of course.

Several other examples have already been noted in the Grammar and the Notes.

The loss of words means too that the application of other words is extended to compensate for it. The surviving word of a near-synonymous group carries the connotations of all the members of the group—probably because in the first instance the variations of the semantic area of each word were not sufficiently clearly understood. When two words are exactly synonymous one ceases to have any function. A typical loss of this kind, and extension of the near-synonym is the case of *pez*. This word has been entirely lost in the contact vernaculars and is replaced by *pescao* which now means both Sp. *pez* and Sp. *pescado*.

Finally, we must note that semantic change, almost always in the direction of extension, as against the restriction of the semantic area, has been very much speeded up by the transfer of Spanish vocabulary to its contact-vernacular context. Words were understood in their general intention and not particular significance: the emphasis on one element means that secondary shades of meaning and application are forgotten. The lack of contact with a conservative literature, or a received standard, on the one hand, and simpler needs, less complicated thoughts and feelings, less acute analysis of phenomena, in short a less complex culture on the other, combine to reduce the distinctions which must be expressed, reduce the vocabulary, and so extend the meanings of words. All the radical changes would occur in the initial period. Thereafter, given the limits of the vocabulary and the lack of control, change would proceed fairly normally.

3. Loan-words

Borrowing words from another language is the reverse of and a kind of compensation for the semantic changes mentioned above. When the need to reestablish or simply establish distinctions is felt, between things for which only a generic term exists, one solution is to borrow a word from another language. I do not know of any example of a coined word in the contact vernaculars.

However, the mass of borrowed words in the contact vernaculars are not of this type. The Tagalog words in the northern contact vernaculars, and the Visayan words in Zamboangueño, are in the main the kind of words which any European language would be driven to borrow from the native language: the names of plants, fruit, trees, insects, fish, particular types of boat, native tools and weapons, and so on. No words for them exist in Spanish, and in numerous instances the borrowing is to be found in Spanish also. They are not of greater interest or significance in this context than in any other.

In Caviteño, however, there are a number of Tagalog words which have been borrowed, not to indicate native things but to reestablish distinctions lost in the reduction of Spanish synonymous groups. In this category are *jelad*, 'to mock at', and *subuk*, 'to watch from cover'.

Zamboangueño, of course, borrows all its plural pronouns and possessives from Cebuano; but this is less a case of 'borrowing' in the technical

sense than an instance of contamination of the dialect by speakers acquainted with Cebuano also. Bilinguals talking to other bilinguals, who are understood whichever of their two languages they use, effect such transferences of vocabulary without its being necessary.

Conclusions

These notes on the vocabularies of the contact vernaculars are necessarily brief. In the first place the material which we have to work on, though adequate for an analysis of the grammar and sound-system of the vernaculars is not sufficient for a complete lexicographic study. These are creolized languages and have therefore a very much larger vocabulary than the contact vernaculars which are the mother-tongues of no one. We have seen that this vocabulary is mainly Spanish, and that native words are used for native objects; that the kind of semantic changes which occur are what one would expect; and that other vocabulary losses are to be explained by the metamorphosis of Spanish syntax and morphology by speakers of another type of language.

A study of the complete lexicon of the contact vernaculars would add little, I feel confident, to what we already know: it would illustrate other kinds of semantic change; it would confirm that it is Mexican Spanish which is the basis of the vocabulary of the contact vernaculars; and it might include some words peculiar to these dialects. But the only important item of information it could add which we do not have at present is the size of the contact-vernacular lexicon. Even here we have sufficient information, by looking at the degree of specialization of vocabulary in the texts we have, to be able to venture a guess, as I have already done above, at something over five thousand words.

APPENDIX

PHONETIC TRANSCRIPTIONS

ALTHOUGH there is clearly a considerable amount of Spanish contamination, and perhaps English also, in each of the transcriptions which follow, I have not attempted to make any emendations. Nor have I attempted any phonemic analysis: the transcriptions, which are semi-narrow, will show the vagaries and inconsistencies of pronunciation which make any such analysis virtually impossible.

The recording of the sample of Ermitaño was made by Mrs Estela Faust, of Manila. The text may be seen on pp. 24—25.

The recording of the sample of Caviteño was made by Mr Manuel P. Vaca, of Manila, formerly of Cavite. The text may be found on pp. 50—51.

The sample of Zamboangueño was recorded by Mr Hipólito Valera, of Manila, formerly of Zamboanga. The texts may be seen on pp. 68—70.

For an explanation of the symbols see the list on pp. viii—ix.

ERMITAÑO

ta su'mi ɛɫ 'soɫ na 'pɔndo dɛɫ mar, j ɛɫ mar, ka'ʎaŭ ɛɫ 'boka, ta hu'ga kɔn su 'mana mare'hadas kom un mu'tʃatʃa nɛr'βjosa kɔn su 'mana puɫ'sɛras. ɛɫ 'bjɛnto nɔ 'mas ɛɫ ke ta aɫbɔrɔ'taˀ, ɛɫ 'bjɛnto j ɛɫ 'pɛtʃo ðe *pɛ'lisa, ke ta 'ʎeno ðe sampa'gitas na 'pwɛra j ta 'ʎeno ðe sus'piros na 'ðɛntro. j 'ɛlle taŋ 'gwapa ke ta kɔmpa'ra 'todo ɛɫ 'hɛnnte kɔn ɛɫ 'bilhɛn san'tisima ðe 'gia, ke ta ʎe'na ðe 'plɔres i kan'dellas na ig'lesja; 'ɛle tam pɛ'lis ke ta hab'la ɛɫ 'mana sɔɫ'tɛra, su 'mana kɔmpa'ɲɛra, komo 'paharo, no aĭ mas 'bida sino bo'la i kan'ta, ta ʎɔ'ra a'gora, ta suspi'ra a'gora, i ta kla'βa 'bweno ɛɫ 'βista na 'ɔlas i na 'sjɛlɔs.

ja ɛstrɛmɛ'se kɔn 'ɛle um 'pwɛlte 'bɔs:

*pɛ'lisa . . .

ja leβan'ta de un ti'rada. ɛl βɔs ke ja sɔ'na kom un 'trweno ja βɔɫ'βe a sɔ'na:

*pɛ'lisa . . .

taĭ . . .

'dɔnde ba ta'ʎa tu, 'rajo?

a'ki na 'hunnto dɛɫ 'mana 'baŋka, taĭ.

ja aparɛ'se ɛl 'βjeho na ðe'tras de 'ɛle, i ja po'de mi'ra ɛɫ 'mana 'ohos de 'ɛle, 'triste kom° ɛɫ 'talde ke ta mɔ'ri na um 'pwɛlte agwa'sɛro ðe rɔsas.

j ɛle taˀ ur'ta ɛɫ 'kara dɛɫ mi'rada dɛɫ 'bjeho, ke ta ɛxsami'na 'bwɛno kɔn 'ɛle; 'pɛro nɔ ja po'de ɛskɔn'deˀ ɛɫ dɔ'lɔr.

ja ʎɔ'ra ba tuʔ 'komo ja ʎɔ'ra tuʔ kjɛn ɛɫ ke ja man'daˀ ʎɔ'ra kɔntigoʔ bi'sa 'prɔnto kjɛn!

ja sɔ̃'reĭ *pɛlisa. nŭ aĭ, taĭ. 'komo de ʎɔ'ra joʔ ja mɛ'te uŋ 'granɔs de a'rena na mi 'ɔhos i ja ha'se lagrimĕ'a 'bwɛnuŋ 'bwɛno kɔn i'lɔs.

ɛ, ta po'de pɛn'sa jo . . .

ja sɛn'ta na su 'hunnto, na 'mizmo ɛs'paɫda dɛɫ 'baŋka 'boka 'baho, i ka'ʎaŭ 'ilos dos, ja bɔ'la ɛɫ dipɛ'rɛnte pɛnsa'mjɛnto de ĭ'los 'komo dos 'paharo.

*pɛ'lisa ta pɛn'sa na su dɛs'grasja, ta pɛn'sa kɔn *'andoĭ, ɛl amɔˀ de 'ɛle de pɔ'bida ke ja desaparɛ'se ũ 'taɫde kom° 'ɛste; kom° 'ɛste nɔ, pɔɫke a'gɔra komo dɔ'raŭ j ɛn a'kɛl 'rɛsjo ɛɫ 'βagjo, na ðe'βaho dɛl 'ɔlas . . . 'kwatro ɛɫ mɛs ke ja pa'sa kɔn 'ɛste, i tres ja ɛl mes kɔn 'ɛste ke ta sin'ti na 'pɔnðo ðe su 'βiða ɛɫ 'βiða ðɛl a'mɔr.

pɔɫke um βi'da ɛɫ ke ja dɛ'ha kɔn 'ɛle; um 'βida ke ja sɛn'ti 'ɛle palpi'ta na 'ðɛntro ðe su 'kwɛlpo ũ 'nɔtʃe 'klaro ðe ɛs'trɛʎas na 'pɔnðo ðe ŭm 'baŋka na maɫ'ðit° a'rena.

j ɛɫ 'βjeho ta pɛn'sa na su 'bida, pɛ'lis a'gɔra, 'maske ɛl 'maðre de *pɛ'lisa ja mɔ'ri ðe 'βjeho. no na'mas dɔs miɫ 'pɛsɔs ɛɫ ke ta gwaɫ'da 'ɛlle na alkan'sia, dɔs miɫ 'pɛsɔs ke ja kɔnbɛɫ'ti ɛn 'kwaɫta tod° ɛl 'mana ɛs'kamas ðe 'plata ke ja kaɫ'ya su 'rɛde na 'sɛɫka de 'kinse 'aɲos i ke 'ɛle ta gwaɫ'da 'para 'kwanðo *pɛ'lisa ðe ka'sa . . . *pɛ'lisa. *sus *ma'ria! ta pi'ha 'bwɛno ɛɫ 'βjeho a'gɔra kɔn 'ɛle, 'blaŋko kom ɛɫ 'mana ɛs'pumas dɛɫ 'mana 'ɔlas, kom° um plɔ dɛl 'ɔlas; ɛl 'ɔhos 'nɛgro, re'dɔndo komo ɫɔm'bɔĭ; ɛɫ 'laβjos 'prɛsko, kɔlɔ'raŭ komo ma'kopas; j ɛl 'pelo 'nɛgro, kom° ɛɫ 'nɔtʃe ke ta rɔm'pɛˀ ɛɫ 'luna a'gɔra . . .

bin ja, ja bi'sa ɛɫ 'βjeho; ta sin'ti jo ɛɫ rɛ'lɛnte na mis pjɛs; ta apɔdɛ'ra na mis 'pjɛɫnas ɛl 'djaske ðe 'reŭma . . .

ja kami'na jlos, tʃiki'tito, 'asta jlos 'kasa na 'hunnto 'mizmo ðɛɫ 'plaja. a'gɔra ɛɫ 'luna 'granðe j rɛ'dɔnndo ta ilumi'na *ɛr'mita komo pa'rɔɫ. j ɛɫ mar ta re'i, ka'ʎaŭ 'sjɛmpre ɛɫ 'boka, ta rej dɛspa'sito, dɛspa'sito.

'kwando ja ke'ða kɔs'taðo *pɛ'lisa, ja rɛ'sa 'pwɛltɛŋ 'pwɛlte kɔn *ðjɔs 'nwɛstro sɛ'ɲɔˀ . . .

sɛ'ɲɔr, sɛ'ɲɔr djɔs 'mio, no kɔnsɛn'ti βos kɔn 'ɛste 'pobre ɛs'klaβa ðe βɔs ɛl a'prɛnta ðɛɫ 'βiða n'sina. ʎe'βa βɔs kɔn'miɣo sɛ'ɲɔˀ 'maske su'pri jo pɔɫ 'kaŭsa ðe mi 'kuɫpa ɛɫ ke βɔs ðe ɔrðɛ'na kɔn mi 'aɫma ke ðe su'pri . . .

ja ke'ða ɛll ðɔɫ'mið° a'lweɣo. j ja sɔ'ɲa ɛɫ an'sina:

ɛle raŭ ta kami'na na 'ɔlas, j ɛl 'ɔlas nɔ ta su'mi kɔn 'ɛle.

'ðɔnðe tu ðe an'ða, *pɛ'lisaʔ ja gri'ta kɔn ɛll su 'tata.

j ɛle raŭ ja rɛpli'kaˀ:

ðe sa'li ja jo kɔn us'teðes, taĭ, pɔɫke 'ɛse 'hɛnnte ðe a'ʎi kɔ̃ ni'sos ma'sjaŭ mal° ɛɫ 'boka, ta prɛtu'ha mi kɔra'sɔn komo 'sipit de ali'masaɣ na su 'lɛŋgwa, ta dɛstro'sa ɛl 'nisos 'ɔnra . . .

j ja aga'ra su taĭ um boɫo j ja pɛɫsɛ'gi kɔn i'los, kɔn 'toðo ɛɫ 'hɛnnte ke si 'kosa-'kosa ɛɫ ke ta βi'sa . . . pɛr° 'ɛle, *pɛ'lisa, ja prɔsɛ'gi su kami'nada sɔbr ɛl 'ɔlas, ði'stannte, ði'stannte, asta ke ja to'pa su 'kara na 'pɔnnðo ðɛɫ 'nubes ke ta sɔstɛ'ne ɫ maˀ.

j ja sɛn'ti 'ɛle na sus 'ohos um 'pwɛlte rɛsplan'ðɔr; ja a'bri 'ɛle 'bwɛn° ɛl 'ɔhos; ja ðɛspɛr'ta ð um bɛs.

ɛɫ sɔɫ ke ta penɛ'tra na βɛn'tan a'βjɛrto, t ɛmpa'pa na su rɛsplan'ðɔˀ ɛl ɛn'tero 'papaɣ, pe'tate, al'mwada, ɛɫ 'pelo ð 'ɛlle kom 'saβanas ke ta ɛmbɔɫ'βe su 'kwɛɫpo, ɛl 'pɔβre 'kwɛɫpo ðɛsgra'sjaŭ . . .

ja fro'ta 'bwɛn ɛl ɔhos; ja prɛsiɣ'na a'lwego, j a'lweg° ɛɫ 'pɔβre ja pɔ'de rɛkɔr'da su 'swɛɲos j ja saɫ'ta ũ 'lagrimas na su 'ohos.

Caviteño

*'pɛðro, 'iho ði 'ɲɔra *ku'lasa, 'bwɛnuŋ-'bwɛnu 'kusi ku'mida. su 'nana ta s ingrandi'si kɔn 'ɛle kɔn tod° ɛɫ 'maŋa 'hɛnte.

un 'dia *'pɛðro ja si'gi kɔ̃ su 'nana na 'patjo para kum'pra 'bjanda. su 'nana, aɫka'βaɫ ði kum'pra kaŋ'greho, ja ha'bla kɔm *'pɛðro: 'bwɛno, riti'ra ja bos, ʎi'βa bos 'ɛsti maŋa kaŋ'greho i ku'si bos 'bwɛnuŋ-'bwɛnu, aʔ

'si, 'naĭ, ja rispun'ði *'pɛðro, j ja riti'ra ja 'ɛle.

ja pu'ni 'ɛle tod ɛɫ 'maŋa kaŋ'greho na un 'ɔʎa i ja prinsi'pĭa di pu'ni 'pwego aɫ ka'lan. 'kwanðo ja mi'ra 'ɛle kɔ̃ŋ ɛɫ 'maŋa kaŋ'greho ta 'briŋka-'briŋka na 'ɔʎa.

ja a'bla ɛle:

kaŋ'greho, kaŋ'greho,
'komo bu'soh ta 'briŋka-'briŋkaʔ
ka'ljɛntɛŋ-ka'ljɛnte ba bu'soh ta sin'tí
a'ʎi na ka'lanʔ
no 'bale, 'lweguŋ 'rato
ði ki'ta jo kɔm bu'soh
j a'ki na mi ba'rriga
ðe'rɛtʃo-ðe'rɛtʃo ð in'tra bu'soh.

ta hiɫ'bi-j-hiɫbi ŋa ɛl 'agwa pɛr° ɛɫ kaŋ'greho no ta ki'da 'blando. 'tjene mah di tres 'ɔra na ka'lan i no pa 'blando.

a'ba, nɔ pa 'blando ! 'taɫðaŋ-'taɫða 'kida ku'sido 'pala 'ɛste 'maŋa kaŋ-'greho, ja ha'bla *'pɛðro.

a'ɔra, 'kwando ja ʎe'ga su 'nana, ja prigun'ta kɔn 'ɛle: *'pɛðro, no pa βa βos ta ku'si ɛɫ 'maŋa kaŋ'greho, aʔ

'taɫðaŋ-'taɫda, 'naĭ, pala ki'da ku'sido ɛɫ kaŋ'greho; tres 'ɔra ja ta hiɫ'bi-hiɫ'bi, nɔ pa 'blando, ja rispun'd'i *'pɛðro kɔn su 'kara i'skuruŋ-i'skuru pɔɫ'kaso ta pasti'dja ja 'ɛle, nɔ 'mas ja ki'da ku'sido.

a'ba nɔ, ja rispun'di nsi'gidas su 'nana, nɔ sa'βe pa βa βos ku'si kaŋ-'greho ast a'ɔraʔ mi'ra jɔ! i ja su'mi su 'ded° a'ðɛntro.

a'ba, nwaĭ mas 'laman ɛɫ kaŋ'greho, 'kosa bos ja ha'si ? 'ke sal'bahe ! pin'sa ba jɔ 'sabɛŋ-sa'be ja boh ku'si.

Zamboangueño

ɛɫ 'hɛnnte ðe sju'ðad,
bjɛn buga'lɔn,
nɔ 'kjere kaminaʔ
'sino 'seða ɛɫ panta'lɔn;
ni 'kjere kɔ'mɛʔ
si ɛl 'ulam ba'yɔn,
'sino kɔ'mɛ gi'saŭ
'karnne kɔn kama'rɔn.

a'ɔra 'ðia j 'nɔtʃe ta pa'saʔ
'ðia j nɔtʃe ta pa'saʔ
kɔn 'sagiŋ lu'ja^{t},
ɛɫ 'pɔβre biɣ ʃa^{t}
ast ɛɫ kaman'tiŋ
'tanan balis'ka^{t}.

'kwanðo jo ja mi'ra vos 'kara,
'blaŋko, 'frɛsko kom° aθu'θena,
ja sɛn'ti jo um mo'mɛnnto 'pena,
ke ta 'dalle dullθ^{e} dɔ'lɔɹ;
i pɔr'ɛso kɔn 'anθjas lɔko,
jo kɔn vos ta vi'vi kan'tanðo,
'para jo ŋa sa'be si 'kwanðo,
sj ɛ'vos kɔn'miɣo 'tjen^{e} amɔɹ.
a'bla ja vos kɔn 'toða fraŋ'keθa, 'ɲɔra,
i kom° na'gɔra, si 'pweðe aɫkan'θar
ɛɫ 'grato 'si k e'vos ta 'dale kon'miɣo,
'para jo vi'vi traŋ'kilo,
sj ɛ'vos kɔn'miɣo 'tjen^{e} a'mɔr.

jo, ɛl a'nak dɛzdi'tʃaðo ðɛl 'munðo,
sin mi 'gusto mi a'mɔr ja ɛntrɛ'gaʔ
kɔn ɛl ɛs'traɲo 'tʃino kɔmɛr'θjante,
ke mi 'tata kɔn'miɣo ja dɛ'haʔ.

pɔr ɛl ka'mino ðe 'hweɣo,
'ɛse jo 'kosa pɛn'saʔ,
'tata j 'nana na 'visjo,
kɔ̃ su a'nak ja ɛntre'gaʔ.

jo ɛl a'nak no aĭ 'mas 'otro rɛ'mɛðjo,
'sino su'pri kɔn 'toðo ɛl kɔra'θɔn,
j aɫβɔ'roto ka'natɔn ta 'dale
toð° ɛɫ 'ðia ɛɫ murmura'θjɔn.

lo ke t a'bla ɛɫ rɛ'pran ðɛɫ 'maɣo 'βjeho,
ɛɫ sɛnti'mjɛnto no 'pweð^{e} agwan'taʔ,
ɛɫ kɔra'θɔn ðɛɫ mu'hɛr siŋ kɔn'swelo,
dɛzdi'tʃaðo mi 'swɛrte pa'taɫ.

a'βaho ðe mi vɛn'tana
tjen^{e} um 'pono di limɔn'sito,
'kaða 'rrama 'sjete 'plɔres,
'kaða 'plɔres um bi'sito.

a'βaho ðe mi vɛn'tana
tjen^{e} um 'pono ðe ka'hɛɫ,
ja par'li 'para kɔmɛʔ
ja sa'li 'sjete mu'hɛʔ.

a'βaho ðe mi ven'tana
tjenᵉ um 'pono ðe naraŋ'hita,
ja par'ti 'para kɔ'mɛɹ
ja sa'li 'sjete βɔ'nita.

INDEX NOMINUM RERUMQUE

INDEX VERBORUM

Note the alphabetical sequence, Contact Vernaculars and Spanish: C, CH; L, LL; N, Ñ; Tagalog: B, K; N, NG.

A. *Ermitaño, Caviteño, and Zamboangueño*

B. Spanish

C. *Tagalog and other Philippine languages*